5c per copy

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Father Coughlin's Weekly Review

Produce For Use At a Fair Profit

Volume III No. 9 | Royal Oak, Michigan | March 1, 1937

KING WAS FORCED OUT, LONDON NOW ADMITS

Edward Spent His Last Night on Plan to Aid England's Poor

EYES and EARS

By Mark Meechan

AS THE heated debating of the president's request for power over the Supreme Court advances, the so-called average citizen is beginning to see through the subterfuge with which the original power-request was padded.

For instance, Attorney General Cummings' recent radio broadcast revealed that the president's message to Congress was "the result of long and intensive study." The average citizen now knows that Mr. Roosevelt went through the campaign for re-election with this thing in his heart.

The question that men and women are asking themselves is: "Why did he not ask the people to approve what he knew was going to be the most important step of his second term in office?"

Mr. Cummings' statement has completely removed any lingering belief that the president stumbled over this nation-arousing idea, by accident, sometime between November 4 and February 5.

Speculation on why he did not bring the issue out openly before the people—so that he might have a clear and incontrovertable mandate from the people—is taking a definite, recognizable trend.

Some account for the president's thunderbolt message as a clear indication that he has acquired genuine contempt for the judgment and the intelligence of the American people.

This conclusion they consider inescapable, because they find

(Continued on Page 3)

Radio 'Gag' Helped Plot to Hide Facts

HOW King Edward VIII, forced from the throne by Britain's "old guard," spent his last night on his native soil going over the details of a vast scheme of relief for his country's poor and distressed people.

How these plans were adroitly "pigeon-holed" by the British ministry in the hope that they would be forgotten along with the exiled king.

How the marriage issue was forced into the foreground to discredit the popular young king in the eyes of his subjects.

These and other revelatory details of the monarch's abdication were disclosed to the American public by Mr. Boake Carter, the popular radio commentator, in his broadcast on the night of Tuesday, February 16. By the courteous permission of Mr. Carter, SOCIAL JUSTICE herewith presents this latest corroboration of our own account of the abdication.

Gave His Last Night to People

By Boake Carter

A great many people have said that Edward VIII threw up his job because he was just tired of being king and wanted an excuse to get out and be free, white and 21, as it were. An incident has just come to light in Great Britain, which tends to confound such superficial thinking.

It is a human, warming incident showing that, on the contrary, Edward was deeply serious about his job as a king, especially where the limited powers that were his applied to the poor in the slum sections, or "distressed areas" as they are called. It was but

(Continued on Page 12)

Ousted and Gagged

Portrait of King Edward VIII of England, copyright Frost & Reed Ltd., London, and International News Photos.

What Do YOU Think?

About Politicians?

About Democracy?

A cross-section of the judgment of America on important public questions is sought in a poll of the readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE. The first series of questions, and the simple rules for entering this new national debate, appear on page 2 of today's issue. Father Chas. E. Coughlin, editor of SOCIAL JUSTICE, invites YOUR frank letters of opinion on these important questions.

Backs Story First Told in Social Justice

The mills of truth, like those of justice, sometimes grind slowly but "exceeding fine."

SOCIAL JUSTICE, in its issue of December 21, charged that the romance of former King Edward VIII with an American divorcee was being used as a pawn by international bankers to drive a strong-willed Windsor from the throne of England.

At long last, this accusation is now officially corroborated in London—although no line of it is printed in American newspapers.

Plans for Poor Alarmed Bankers

It is now definitely disclosed that Edward was ousted by a reactionary clique, led by Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, **because he was planning to break away from the traditionally inactive role prescribed for the king in the Magna Charta and force through laws in the interest of the suffering people.**

Recent developments in London disclose furthermore that Edward had presented a plan for relief of his impoverished subjects to a member of the British cabinet just before he was deposed by the bankers. It was this relief plan — providing land grants and government loans to the hopelessly unemployed—that forced the king to abdicate his throne in favor of his brother, George VI.

Edward's publicized love for Mrs. Wallis Simpson was only a surface pretext used by Baldwin and the Bank of England to discredit and compromise the popular young king in the eyes of the English people.

Relief Plan "Pigeon-Holed"

Further corroboration of these facts disclosed by SOCIAL JUSTICE was made in America last week by Mr. Boake Carter, noted radio commentator. But so far as we are able to observe at this

(Continued on Page 12)

What Do YOU Think?

AS EDITOR OF **SOCIAL JUSTICE**, I am intensely interested in obtaining answers to the questions printed below on this page.

Many readers, probably, will be shocked to learn that some of the principles incorporated in these questions should be questionable.

Other readers, probably, will be of the opinion that the questions are empty and idle.

However, the majority of readers will recognize that these questions are very much alive. They are questions that require answering without any pussy-footing. In most cases, America cannot suffer these questions to remain undebated.

Therefore, I am inviting every reader of **SOCIAL JUSTICE** to participate in this national debate.

A simple "Yes" or an unmeaning "No" will not be accepted. Approximately 100 words should accompany your vote.

Calls for a Commitment

This issue of **SOCIAL JUSTICE** prints two groups of questions. The first group deals with politics and politicians. The second group deals with democracy and dictatorship.

In no sense is it to be interpreted that **SOCIAL JUSTICE** is commiting itself either for or against any one of these questions at the present time. The sole purpose is to canvass the minds of our readers.

We pledge to each reader that we will neither use his name nor publicize his answer, unless express permission to do so is contained in the writer's letter.

As you observe, these questions are graduated. Both sections lead up to a conclusive answer and a commitment. The answers to the first group of questions will commit you either **FOR** or **AGAINST** politicians. The answers to the second group of questions will commit you either **FOR** or **AGAINST** modern democracy.

Cross-Section of America

Many questions have been purposely omitted. As a sample, the question could have been asked: "Is democracy a safeguard for Christianity?" Answers to similar questions may be incorporated by readers in the replies which they send to me.

This is no idle debate. **SOCIAL JUSTICE** is anxious to acquire a cross-section judgment of America, on questions which are being discussed for the most part in private. Nevertheless, they are questions which are being universally discussed. Soon they will be published and discussed in many newspapers.

I am not endeavoring to **bribe** the readers of **SOCIAL JUSTICE** to become contestants in this debate, because such a policy would detract from the merits of the answers.

I am not asking you to coincide with any opinions which I have expressed, either in this weekly review or over the air waves.

I simply want your honest decision and your reason for it. You may think that your reason is not important. It may be the best reason in the world.

Charles Coughlin

Politicians

1. **Are politicians, as a class, the best citizens in America?**
2. **Are politicians more interested in themselves than in the people whom they represent?**
3. **Are politicians more interested in party-ism than in patriotism?**
4. **Are politicians, as a rule, subject to the argument of graft, either through direct or indirect means?**
5. **Are politicians, as a class, time-servers and "Yes-men" for the dispensers of graft and political preferments?**
6. **Are politicians, as a class, chiefly responsible for the social conditions in which America finds itself?**
7. **Is it possible to clean up politics by swapping parties?**
8. **Are politics and politicians an impediment to recovery?**
9. **Would America be a happier country if all politicians were liquidated?**

Social Justice Poll Seeks Readers' Views in a National Debate

Anxious to obtain its own cross-section of the judgment of America on important public questions—so important that they are still discussed only in private — SOCIAL JUSTICE herewith begins the first of a new series of questions in a national debate.

This is not just another contest. There are no complicated rules—no coupons to be filled out. Simply go down through the list of questions, in the privacy of your own home or office, and write your honest answer "Yes" or "No." Then incorporate your answers **and your reasons for them,** in a simple brief statement of 100 words and mail them to Father Chas. E. Coughlin, editor of SOCIAL JUSTICE, Royal Oak, Michigan.

As an incentive to all who enter into this national debate, SOCIAL JUSTICE is preparing to award credit prizes **to every debater.**

All subscribers to SOCIAL JUSTICE are eligible to participate in this debate.

Non-subscribers, to be eligible, must enclose with their letter the date line of this issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, which can be clipped from the top of any page.

Bear in mind that your letter must give approximately a hundred-word reason for your answer.

Fine writing or literary style will not count.

Your own honest opinion about these important questions is the thing that is desired.

Write that freely and frankly in your own way.

Every letter will be acknowledged. A box score of percentages FOR and AGAINST each question will be published.

In next week's issue other questions will be printed.

The questions herewith listed will not appear again, except insofar as we shall report to you the percentages of "Yes" and "No."

Democracy

1. **Is democracy, as we have it in America, a government of the people, by the people and for the people?**
2. **Is democracy in THEORY, a better form of government than monarchy or dictatorship?**
3. **Is democracy in FACT, a better form of government than monarchy or dictatorship?**
4. **Is democracy sound insofar as it gives every adult an equal right to vote?**
5. **Is democracy more secure when the right to vote is limited to property owners?**
6. **Is democracy more secure when the right to vote is limited to high school graduates?**
7. **Is democracy weakened when votes are obtained by reason of patronage and not by reason of the merit of the contestant?**
8. **Is democracy in America only a fiction, and not a reality?**
9. **Is democracy a hide-out for politicians and big interests?**
10. **Is democracy obsolete, and should there be substituted for it another form of government?**

Battle of the Century Looms Over Court on Capitol Hill

EYES *and* EARS

(Continued from Page 1)

his new attitude so different from his public conduct during his first term.

They recall his regular fireside chats when, so to speak, he took the nation into his confidence and created in the minds of millions the impression that, while he enjoyed greater personal power than any previous first executive, he was using his power solely in the interests of the people.

These old friends and new doubters of the president remember that formerly he never initiated any major policy without first sending up trial balloons to sound out the attitude of the public.

He used to be, they say, as they shake puzzled heads, a great example of a people's president.

And now the thing that worries them is the fear that, if the president has acquired a contempt for the intelligence of the people, he will logically reveal a disregard for their will.

That would lead to a lessening concern for the people's rights and the people's welfare.

* * *

History shows that great power inevitably changes men. Uneasy citizens recall the classic example of Napoleon.

He rose to power as the leader of a people who engaged in revolution against the entrenched royalty of the Bourbons to gain freedom and equality.

But Napoleon used the great faith that the people of France placed in him to build a new monarchy with himself as emperor.

The French Revolution ended in the empire, which prospered for a few short years and fell amid bloodshed and the complete disorganization of the French nation. For their few years under a strong and popular dictator the people paid with decades of political turmoil and economic stagnation.

The end of it all was democracy. Napoleon was an unnecessary and retarding interlude.

In young America a similar struggle for freedom was being waged, almost simultaneously with the French Revolution.

Out of that struggle emerged a great leader, Washington.

(Continued on Page 15)

Social Justice Presents

The New National Debate	Page 2
Father Coughlin's Radio Text	Pages 6-7
Editorials	Page 4
Face to Face with the Flood	Page 5
Social Justice Laurel Wreath	Page 16
Mystery Man of World Finance	Pages 8-9
"Know Social Justice" Contest	Page 14
Box Score on the Motor Strike	Page 11
John L. Lewis' One Big Union	Page 10
The Week in the World	Page 15
Facts Support Story on King	Page 12
The People Speak	Page 13

Either Way Senate Votes, It's Fatal to Democrats; View of Veteran Leaders

By Staff Correspondent of SOCIAL JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A feeling of alarm—downright terror in some cases—has gripped the rank and file of Democrats on Capitol Hill this past week. To one who saw them troop in here early in January, flushed by their great triumph at the polls in November, they are hardly recognizable today as they grieve over President Roosevelt's audacious proposal to make over the Supreme Court.

They find themselves in what seems an impossible dilemma. One moment they are fearful that Roosevelt's court bill will be defeated, or at least lacerated; the next moment they are harassed by the thought that it will pass. Granted that this sounds paradoxical, it nevertheless sums up what appears to them as a true situation.

Listen to a veteran Democratic member of the House of Representatives:

"This Supreme Court bill is the president's own. It is by far the most important he has ever sent down. If it is beaten, it means Roosevelt has been repudiated. And repudiation of Roosevelt means repudiation of the Democratic party. Where does that leave us members who have to run next year on a Democratic platform?

Veteran Leader Call It Dynamite

"But now suppose the bill passes and Roosevelt puts his six New Dealers in the Supreme Court. A lot of people, I suppose, are going to claim it as a great party victory. Well, you won't hear me making any such claim. **I tell you, this thing is dynamite, and the blast from it is going to be heard for years to come.**

"I don't know whether a majority of the people in my district are for this bill or against it. Heaven help me, I wish I did. But this I do know: The people who are against it are so angry, so violently against it, that I dread to think of what they are going to do to us, even if they are in the minority.

"I have received some letters from constituents who want me to support the president, but I notice that they are no where near as passionate about it as the opponents.

"The way I see it, we are going to lose even if we win, and a lot of Democrats are going to be missing around here in the next Congress. Life would have been much nicer if our great president had chosen another way."

There was something almost pathetic in the eagerness with which the House Democrats leaped at the chance to pass the Sumners bill, a measure permitting Supreme Court justices to retire at 70 with full pay. They hoped, of course, that this might be a "way out"—that some of the justices would retire, thus making it possible for Mr. Roosevelt to inject new blood into the court. Maybe, too Mr.

(Continued on Page 15)



Are You Visiting the Shrine With Your City's Excursion?

Since numerous inquiries have been made as to when would be the most enjoyable time to visit the Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Mich., Father Coughlin has planned to dedicate certain Sundays of the summer to the different cities and states of the Union.

On that Sunday all the services and ceremonies will be performed in special honor of the visitors from those cities and states for whom the day has been dedicated.

If you are interested in leading a group of friends to the Shrine in Royal Oak, get in touch with your local railroad passenger agent or write directly to Father Coughlin. Others are planning to lead a caravan of cars to the Shrine on that Sunday.

An enjoyable and interesting program of events are to be arranged for that day, including a cordial welcome by Father Coughlin to all the visitors.

Next week a complete program of ceremonies for the various Sundays will be published. The tentative schedule of Sundays to be dedicated to visitors from the different cities and towns of the country is as follows:

May 23—Canadian Day. Ontario-Quebec.
May 30—New York City, Brooklyn and surroundings.
June 20—Western New York, including Buffalo, Syracuse, Albany.
July 4—New England States.
July 18—Pennsylvania, New York and New Jersey.
July 25—Cincinnati, Chicago, Indiana, St. Louis, Kansas City.
August 8—Cleveland, Toledo and Northern Ohio.
August 15—Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D. C.
August 22—Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin.
September 5—National Day. (For All.)

SOCIAL JUSTICE

FATHER COUGHLIN'S WEEKLY REVIEW

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

March 1, 1937 162 Volume III No. 9

Copyright, 1936, by The Social Justice Publishing Company; published weekly; publication and editorial office, Box 150, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $2.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, we begin all subscriptions with the current issue. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1936, at the post Office at Royal Oak, Michigan, under the act of March 3, 1879.

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

1. **Liberty of conscience and education.**
2. **Just, living, annual wage.**
3. **Nationalization of important public resources.**
4. **Private ownership of all other property.**
5. **Control of private property for public good.**
6. **Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a government-owned Central Bank.**
7. **Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.**
8. **Maintain cost of living on an even keel.**
9. **Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.**
10. **Labor's right to organize.**
11. **Recall of non-productive bonds.**
12. **Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.**
13. **Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.**
14. **Simplification of government and lower taxes.**
15. **Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.**
16. **Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property; with government's chief concern for the poor.**

Propaganda De Luxe

PROPAGANDA is the art of high-pressuring the masses into believing that which, on its own merits, they would never believe.

It is the instrument which needlessly plunged this country into a World war where nothing could possibly have been gained—for us or for the world.

It was the method chosen by the allied governments, during the war, to blacken the German people to an extent that, ever since the war hysteria subsided, has seemed worse than absurd.

It is the voice alike of Communism and Fascism whereby dictators convince one mass that one philosophy of government is right and another mass that the opposite theory is right.

Propaganda is never employed to convince people that the truth is true, that virtue is virtue, that right is right. Those things are self-evident.

We have been forewarned that the citizens of the United States are about to be propagandized as never before.

Evidently, President Roosevelt presumed upon his large popular majority in the last election to the extent that he thought the people would applaud any and every policy that he might propose.

He has been stunned by the spontaneous and widespread dismay which greeted his message on transforming the Supreme Court into a rubber stamp.

For the first week or so following the publication of his message, the Congress and the public were given to understand that it was the will of the White House that enabling legislation be pushed through Congress immediately.

That has all been changed now. Too many members of the president's own party in Congress, too many of his good friends, who also enjoy the high regard of the people, have broken with him on this issue.

Too large a majority of the letters and wires going into Washington the past few weeks have been violently opposed to demeaning the highest court in the land.

So the great New Deal propaganda machine is being limbered up. Charlie Michelson, the "Goebels" of the reigning American faction, has been suddenly called back to Washington from a vacation trip.

On the radio, you will begin to hear at least 10 New Deal satelites to every one opponent of the new court measure.

The newspapers will be flooded with history and statistics proving that the only way to sustain democracy is to let President Roosevelt hand-pick six new judges who will be the absolute balance of power in the Supreme Court.

America, you have failed to see eye to eye with your popular president! Therefore you are about to be propagandized!

Predicting Notable Omissions

PROPAGANDA succeeds only when it is made plausable and appealing. The adroit and successful propagandist never attempts to cram the bald truth down the throats of the people.

Propaganda, therefore, is always a one sided picture done in brilliant colors. It never portrays both sides of a question.

Knowing that essential principle of propaganda, we venture to prophesy that two very important topics will be completely omitted from the picture which the New Deal will paint for doubting America.

The fact that President Roosevelt, should he be given authority to appoint six new justices to the Supreme Court, will have, in fact, the same power as Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini will omitted from the picture.

It will be said that those who charge that the president seeks power over the court are "maligning the president." It will be said that the president has been a good and great friend of the people. It will be said that the president is trying to make democracy work.

But it will not be said that what he seeks is, in very truth—and regardless of his plans for using it—precisely the power that identifies the dictator of today, the absolute monarch of yesterday.

The very possession of that power by any man weakens democracy—no one can deny that. **As a matter of fact it will not be denied. It will be dodged!**

Another grave omission in the new propaganda will be the failure of the New Deal to call in the most competent witness in all our history on the subject of the safe distribution of the powers of government.

George Washington will not be called on to testify in support of the president's request for power over the court. He was against that sort of thing. He said so explicitly in his immortal "Farewell Address." He would be a bad witness for present purposes.

Propaganda, by its very nature is insincere—you can always recognize it, if you are mentally awake, by **its omissions.**

Resorting to the Contemptible

NO PUPPET is too weak to serve the purpose of the propagandist. Even the little ones, who will join the propagandist's chorus, add something to its volume.

And thus Billy Green, the vacillating president of the American Federation of Labor, is an early volunteer to the chorus of anti-court propaganda.

Since Billy stepped a long way out of his domain and "double-crossed" the farmers by writing a letter in which he strove to throw the weight of labor against the farmer's Frazier-Lemke Bill, it has been quite generally assumed that he can be called in by the ruling faction to make a pronouncement on almost any subject.

Even more contemptible than the puppeteering of Green is the type of indirection by which Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, sought to nullify the express opposition to the president's proposal of the National Grange.

The Grange is the oldest and one of the largest of the farmers' organizations—yet Henry Wallace says:

"The farmers, I think, are very much concerned with the slowness and inadequacy of the courts."

The question is: Who speaks for the farmers—Henry Wallace or the farmers?

And the larger question is: Is America going to be propagandized into accepting a virtual dictatorship?

Questions and Answers

In the February 15 edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE, there appeared in the "Questions and Answers" column incorrect statements pertaining to the United States government's present share of the profits and ownership of stock in the Federal Reserve Banks.

Directly, the government owns no stock in the Federal Reserve Banks. Indirectly, however, it does, insofar as the United States government now owns at least **24 per cent of all the capital stock of all the local banks.** In a way, therefore, the government gains 24 per cent of all the profits made through the activities of the Federal Reserve Banks!

Nevertheless, 75 per cent of all capital stock of all local banks is owned by private individuals and, consequently, 75 per cent of the Federal Reserve profits belong to private individuals. Since the Federal Reserve issues at least 90 per cent of all the currency money and credit money of the United States, it is making a profit which should not belong to it because Congress alone has the power to issue and regulate money.

Communism

Question: In case we are ever called upon to make a decision, what would be your advice to one who is willing to give his life for Christ but, at the same time, feels that the Communists are justified in fighting for their cause? Surely, there must be some reason why a Communist is a Communist.

—Mary Agnes Walter.
Emmitsburg, Md.

Answer: Father Coughlin began a full and frank discussion on "Christianity versus Communism" during his broadcast of February 7th, the full text of which appears in the February 15th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE. Another address in the series is printed today.

Townsend Plan

Question: Why are the Communists opposed to the Townsend Plan?

—Fred W. Clute.
Dubuque, Iowa.

Answer: Naturally, the Communist will support no measure which is not conducive to the ultimate attainment of his objectives. There is nothing in the provisions of the Townsend Plan which would enable a Communist to achieve his atheistic ideals of material prosperity and the abolition of Christianity.

Government

Question: Is the United States government and the federal government one and the same thing?

—Charles F. Maines.
Philadelphia, Pa.

Answer: The citizens of our nation popularly use the term, "federal government," when referring to the United States government. Strictly speaking, however, this term is a general one applied to any union of states over which there is a central government possessing certain exclusive powers, while the remaining powers are held separately by the local governments. Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Russia all have federal governments which, of course, differ widely in the power delegated to the central government. Usually, federal powers include war, coinage, foreign relations and commerce.

Face to Face With the Big Flood

Staff Writer Shares Work of Red Cross

When Father Coughlin went on the air to appeal for the flood relief fund, thousands or persons responded with contributions to station WLW and the Red Cross. Helen De Camillo of the staff of SOCIAL JUSTICE gave even more. Slipping a cover over her typewriter, she announced quietly but determinedly that she was joining the Red Cross nursing staff "at the front." Her own story of that experience is recounted here.

The North will never know and the South will never forget the horrors of the most disastrous flood ever experienced in the United States, during this winter of 1937. The phenomena of nature were very apparent, in this struggle by man against elements over which he had no control.

The keenest imaginations cannot hope to depict the hardships and suffering endured by our Southern neighbors. To the North the flood meant grim stories in their evening newspapers, interesting, exciting and terrible tales told over the radio.

I, too, heard these programs on the air and read the stories night after night in the local papers. I, too, thought them exciting. That is why I went south. True, I was going to offer my services as a nurse but I really went to witness the exciting things about which I had read so much. I am ashamed, now to think of the attitude I held. Now I know that the papers did not exaggerate, nor were the radio programs overdone. They were true and our fellow countrymen were suffering every bit as much as you were led to believe.

Joins Red Cross At Evansville

It seemed logical that where the work was there would be the most excitement and where the work was to be done there also would be the Red Cross. Since the Red Cross from Detroit had not as yet been called upon, it was necessary for me to report to a headquarters in some section of the flood area. I choose Evansville, Ind.

Three hundred blocks were already inundated when I arrived in Evansville. The waters were still rising and rescue work was in progress. The general confusion and turmoil prevalent throughout the entire city was a spectacle never to be forgotten. The old and the young that had been transferred from their isolated homes to the higher lands were wandering aimlessly through the streets. The youths as a whole were in a hysterical condition while their parents and the older people were stunned beyond the power of reasoning.

One old couple who had been forced to evacuate their home, were standing at the water's edge staring into space. How long they had been standing there nobody knows but it was only with the most tactful persuasion that they were induced to return to the Coliseum where the refugees were being cared for by the Red Cross.

Hotels Without Heat, Light, Water

The hotel where I registered—and conditions were the same in all the other hotels in the city—could only be reached by a temporary bridge, or by boat. The lobby and the basement had been flooded and as a result the heating plant was completely out of commission. The electric light wires were down and the telephone connections were temporarily out of order. The employes of the hotels, including the desk clerk and all bell boys, worked with hats and coats on and mufflers wrapped securely around their necks in an effort to counteract the piercing cold and dampness.

I had often seen useless, empty oil drums in alleys but I never dreamed that a day would come when I would welcome one in a hotel lobby as a temporary stove. Bricks were placed on the floor in a circle and the drum was placed on top of them. Chairs were arranged around this "stove" and it was a case of first come first served. Personally, I never had time to take advantage of the heat but it was a blessing to those persons who had nothing to do with their time, and believe me there were plenty of them.

Sanitary Conditions Of First Concern

To add to the already overabundant troubles, the water works plant was among those buildings hit by the flood waters. No running water in hotels or public buildings is a story in itself needing no explanation. Sanitary conditions were given the immediate attention of the city officials.

I noticed particularly the many notices appearing in the local newspapers, on all bulletin boards and any other available place, warning the people against the danger of typhoid from impure drinking water. Strict orders were given to drink only water that had previously been doctored with chloride or to boil the city water at least 30 minutes.

All nurses and other workers who came into immediate contact with the refugees were instructed to warn them of the deadly germs, threatening city-wide epidemic, that lurked in the water supply and to ask them not to endanger their own lives and add to the problems of the city by helping to develop such an epidemic. It would be useless for me to try to figure out the number of persons to whom I transmitted these instructions.

No Romance on This River Boat

Since it was impossible to reach all the southern cities by car or train, all available boats were summoned and it was on one of these hospital boats that I was given my best opportunity to see the stricken cities as well as the many vacated farms. The idea of traveling down the Ohio and the Mississippi in a steamboat with a paddle on the back splashing the water against the sides of the boat in rhythm with the waves had always struck me as being very romantic.

I had come to this conclusion too hastily; there was nothing "romantic" from the moment we left dock. To me steamboats had meant "darkies" loafing around the deck, "mammies" working in the kitchen preparing delicious meals for the passengers, soft guitar music with now and then a negro spiritual, and the sweet, perfumed odor of magnolia blossoms in the air.

In contrast I was greeted with exhausted deck hands, no meals, very little drinking or washing water, houses floating down the swollen river, a short-wave radio station that gave nothing but reports of trouble, dead animals in the muddy waters and now and then a human body that had to be dragged out with a fish hook, a discolored, bloated body that was beyond recognition. Certainly there was nothing romantic about this.

Crisis Creates Unsung Heroism

Our boat had occasion to stop at Metropolis, Ill. This city, with a population of approximately 10,000 was completely cut off. Metropolis, situated on the Ohio, midway between Evansville and Cairo, suffered equally with the larger cities as far as the flood waters were concerned but it had the added misfortune of having no outside help.

To two practically unknown boys of Metropolis should go the heartfelt thanks of the city and the surrounding communities.

Let me tell the story as I saw it:

Sleepy Waters, a young man of about 25, is regularly employed in the city of Metropolis. Sleepy had been married only a short time and is the father of what is now known as a "flood baby." Sleepy and his young wife had purchased a small house on the outskirts of Metropolis; an investment which represented the family fortune. Shortly before the arrival of the baby the flood hit Metropolis and the young couple's home was destroyed.

His friend, Bill, a mechanic, a married man with a 4 year old son, was also a victim of the disaster. His home and gasoline station with service garage adjoining were ruined.

The two boys did everything possible for their own families; then they went to work.

Rig Out Ferry At Own Expense

Bill secured a boat in the city and was successful in equiping it with a Ford Model A motor. Two seven-ton barges were attached to either side of the "now motor boat" and the boys were ready for action.

From dawn until dark the two boys ferried across the swollen Ohio in their make-shift craft transporting food and people. Their work was done without the aid of the government or the local authorities. Gasoline used was purchased with their own scant funds until at last they humbly confessed that they were "broke" and would have to stop. When this announcement was made, help, in the form of gasoline was immediately given them.

When I left Metropolis these courageous friends were still ferrying food and citizens across the river. They were tired mentally and physically. Neither had seen their families for days. Neither knew what he was going to do when the waters subsided, yet both toiled on.

Valiant Is the Word for Cairo

From Metropolis the boat set out for Cairo, Ill. Cairo, where the Mississippi meets the Ohio, was the main point of interest throughout the entire flood days. In the early days of the high water, before the raging Ohio crest had neared Cairo,

(Continued on Page 12)

Snapshots at the Flood Front



This hotel at Evansville, Indiana (left), with lobby under water and upper floors without heat, light or water, stands on U. S. 41. A stop light on the highway is barely above water. The line of trees dim in the distance marks the north bank of what ought to be the Ohio river. Right—Bit of emergency wall atop the Mississippi levee which saved the city of Cairo. Photos by Helen De Camillo of the staff of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

From Typewriter to Hospital Boat



Helen De Camillo of the editorial staff of SOCIAL JUSTICE (above) felt that it would be romantic to see the big flood at first hand. She paid for the thrills by grim hard work as a Red Cross nurse aboard a river rescue boat.

Text of Father Coughlin's Sunday

Washington's Farewell Address

SUNDAY FEBRUARY 21, 1937

IT IS ALMOST with misgivings that I trespass upon the hallowed memory of George Washington. On this, the eve of his birthday, however, my trespassing must be interpreted as that of a pilgrim who is anxious to pay tribute to the brilliant genius whose shining was destined to prepare the way for the greatness which, under God, has been achieved by America.

The misgivings which I entertain in venturing to sound the name of our country's father arise from an ever-increasing apprehension that he, like the setting sun, belongs to a passing day. Time was when his golden dawn melted into the clear day of Jackson. Time was when it rose, then sank behind the dark clouds of the Civil War, only to reappear more resplendent than ever in the noonday glory of Lincoln.

Blazing its course across the western sky, this burning sun of liberty coaxed into maturity a throbbing, thriving nation. What though clouds gathered in the sky to dim his luster? If, occasionally, there were reports of insignificant religious bickerings, they were soon cancelled by deeds of tolerance and charity. If drouths appeared, they were soon forgotten by an abundance of wheat and corn and cotton. Man-made depressions raised thei. ugly heads, only to be crushed to earth again by the stern heel of justice. But at all times America was beloved and Washington was revered because, under his constant leadership, good triumphed over evil as long as we held fast to his traditions.

Tomorrow America will pause to pay tribute to its founder. Alas! shall we pay tribute to his principles?

Who are we Americans? From what loins have we sprung—Celt and Nordic, Slav and Latin, Black and White? More than six centuries ago bold seafarers touched our shores. Then came Columbus with the Pinta, Santa Maria and the Nina, so beautifully referred to as the ships of Faith, of Hope and of Charity.

Those were days when the flower of Europe's beauty began to wither. Religious hatred grew apace. The glory of feudalism was already fading. Serfdom and servitude on the one hand, with dukedom and domination on the other, were breeding mass poverty and crystallizing individual wealth. Those were the days when Europe began to cultivate its theory of the divine right of kings and when kings began to establish alliances amongst themselves, not for the preservation of right and liberty, but rather for their desecration.

Who are we? From what loins have we sprung? Trace your ancestry back to the English Mayflower. Resurrect the spirit of those who followed the French LaSalle. Listen to the echoes of the voices of Hendrick Hudson and his companions which still reverberate amongst the Catskills or hearken to the moans which still brood over the Irish Sea if you would know whence you sprang.

Lashed by the thongs of persecution, your ancestors and mine came to America when it was more or less a wilderness. They had been driven out of Europe because tolerance had been slain. They were content to leave its churches and schools, its hillsides and farmlands because there was no Simon of Cyrene to help them bear their cross up the Calvary where death awaited them.

We are the rebels—sons and daughters of emigrants. We are the fugitives, children of destiny! Our land is the crucible into which was poured the blood of every nation fulfilling the destiny of a kind Providence, Who not only raised Himself from the dead but Who gave us an opportunity to lift on high the trampled flag of liberty and the broken crown of brotherly love.

Of these things I would remind you on the eve of Washington's birthday. For today the blood of many races and the pride of many nationalities melt and merge into one nation.

My fellow countrymen, 137 years have passed since Washington was laid to rest. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that even in these days of fierce political conflict, he must be reputed by us now, as he was by the people almost a century and a half ago—**"first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen."**

Invigorated by the recollections which I have uttered, I feel somewhat encouraged to disregard the misgivings which were mine when I began to address you. Thus, I deem this to be an opportune occasion to read a portion of the last will and testament which Washington composed in two famous farewell addresses.

Were I gifted with a magic wand, I would roll back the calendar of time to the year 1783. I would take you to Fraunce's Tavern in New York City where met the leading officers of the colonial army to listen to their leader as he took leave of them to become our first president. Solemnly he speaks these words to his brothers in arms: "With a heart full of love and gratitude," said he, "I must now take my leave of you. I most devoutly wish that your latter days may be as prosperous and happy as your former ones have been glorious in arms . . .

"In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish, or that they will control the usual current of passions . . . But I do hope that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good. I hope that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischief of foreign intrigue, to guard against the imposters of pretended patriotism. This hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dedicated."

So spoke Washington to his fellow officers who had suffered with him at Valley Forge. Undoubtedly tears streamed down the hardened faces of these stalwart men. From their midst there was retiring the greatest leader this world ever knew. Oh, but could they have envisioned our day when the fury of the party spirit is "lashed by the passions of a social hurricane"; when "the imposters of pretended patriotism" wax eloquent as they cast aspersions upon the past! Their hearts would have been broken when confronted with such ingratitude.

Was it not their swords which had struck for freedom? Was it not their brothers' lives which had paid for it? Was it not their country which they had wrested from the hands of a dictator?

My fellow countrymen, when one is making his last will and testament he is not in the mood of an actor. That hour is too sacred, too solemn for any words except those which are born in the profoundest depths of sincerity and truth.

In his even more famous farewell to the nation, when taking leave of the presidency in 1796, Washington again reminded his hearers of this when he said:

"You can only see in my words the disinterested warnings of a parting friend who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel."

Thus, my friends, this memorable farewell address could have had no other motive than concern for the welfare of this country.

Incorporated in it, among other things, were three momentous admonitions: **At all costs, preserve the unity of our nation; at all times, remain free from foreign entanglements; and under all circumstances, cling fast to our Constitution.**

Relative to the unity of our government, Washington says: "It is the main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home and your peace abroad . . . But it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters many pains will be taken, many artifices employed to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth. This is the point in your political fortress against the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively directed . . . Citizens, by birth or by choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections."

Today, as of yesterday, no American is worthy of the name American who prostitutes his efforts to other nations under the specious sophistry of the brotherhood of man. With rapier-like intelligence the Father of our Country settled once and for all that heresy expounded by internationalists as he gave his benediction to an uncompromising patriotism.

Confronted with more important matters, I shall dispense with commenting further upon Washington's admonition to retain the integrity of our Union. Passingly may I remark, however, that this Union of which we are so proud is vulnerable not only through the secession of states, but also through the embitterments of partyism and through the growth of class hatreds.

Behold the fate of Mexico and Spain! In those nations there was no discussion of severing state from state. But there arose conflicts confined only by the extreme borders of those nations between the classes and the masses.

Civil strife originating in this manner is infinitely more disastrous in its consequences than civil strife which is born in the cradle of political differences. To preserve the Union at all costs, suggests Washington, we must eliminate from our body politic the cancerous causes which engender in America what is transpiring in Spain.

Listen to him again as he formulates the sacred traditions which are opposed to foreign entanglements. Said he: "We must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government . . .

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake . . .

"The great rule of conduct for us, in respect to other nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as posssible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

In 1914 there were Americans who heeded not this counsel. In 1918 there were pseudo-Americans, false to their traditions, false to the Father of their Country, and false to their fellow citizens, who openly ridiculed it. It was they who raised the hypocritical cry of saving democracy when, in truth, they intended to save the liquidity of their debtors.

Thus, step by step, we were led into the carnage of the World war. The ambassadorial letters emanating from Mr. Page at London indicated a pre-determination on the part of our rulers and of English rulers to embroil us in foreign entanglements, foreign intrigue and foreign slaughter. The Lusitania was but the occasion for our entrance into it.

From that moment, politicians began to weave a veil of disrespect with which to mantle the features of Washington. Pleading the cause of international brotherhood when, in reality they were pleading the cause of international banking, these same false leaders, forgetful of our ancestors' history, veered the course of the ship of state from the deep waters of sane nationalism which Washington had sounded, into the shallows of Russian Communism, of British imperialism and of continental socialism.

In this way, through the media of world courtism and of international financialism there was builded up a scaffold which towered above the dome of our Capitol. And upon it was hanged in effigy—verbal effigy, if you will—the traditions of him who in his last will and testament had warned us against foreign entanglements. This was patriotism which a real patriot would designate as an assassination. This was diplomacy which a real patriot would classify as betrayal. This was progress—progress going backwards, progress, returning to the bigotry, to the bloodshed, to the persecution, to the serfdom from which your forefathers and my forefathers had fled.

In 1937, even before the wounds of the last World war are healed, a saddened world, unable to disentangle itself from the grip of an invisible international government, is being condemned to death in a modern Pilate's Hall.

(Continued on Page 7)

Radio Broadcast on Washington

(Continued from Page 6)

The overlords are conspiring to overturn civilization, if necessary, rather than suppress their hates, their greeds and their commercial ambitions. The cries of 10-million corpses, the waste of $186-billion squandered for the direct cost of military activities, the destruction of $151-billion sustained by property losses, the futility of the Versailles Peace Treaty pact are discredited witnesses which join with Washington in beseeching us to hold ourselves free from the next World War even though a hundred Lusitanias, together with false honor, be submerged in the depths of the Atlantic!

At this very hour when the merchandisers of murder have flung wide open the doors of their infernal markets; at this very hour when more than $27-billion has been allocated by nations to resurrect the spirit of Cain, the first assassin, shall America sit by complacently, resting her security upon a mere man's promise as we did in 1916? Or shall Americans rise in unison from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, from the Golden Gate to Plymouth Rock, to demand a revival of Washington's policy of "no foreign entanglements," no secret treaties, no financial aid, no military succor to those nations where perfidy and dishonor, where dictatorship and serfdom reign supreme?

My fellow Americans, as I proceed in recalling the memory of our beloved Father, the misgivings which at first I entertained have vanished. I have found courage to record for you the counsel of Washington on the subject of the Constitution of the United States. In the following prophetic words, whose meaning cannot be mistaken, he warned against the dangers now facing us:

"The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissensions, which, in different ages and countries, has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.

"The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; **and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty."**

What language could have been chosen more clearly or more definitely to describe the crisis which, with stunning suddenness, has come upon us?

This voice from beyond the grave warns us and counsels us.

Shall we follow the counsel of a man whose wisdom compasses the ages, or shall we fellow the inspiration of those who confess themselves to be experimenters in government simply because the "disorders and miseries" of the day incline us to despair?

If, unmindful of the glories of the past; if forgetful of the providential position which Washington, our Father, holds for us; and if neglectful of the inspired traditions he bequeathed to us, we should choose unfortunately to erect a dictatorship in America at the cost of democracy, we shall live to rue that day. At some future time, perchance, clothed in the ashes and sackcloth of repentance, we will find ourselves searching in the charred ruins of some library. There we will discover a scorched parchment upon which was imprinted "Washington's Farewell Address." What though a dictator has censored it! We will clasp it to our bosom and in the privacy of solitude we will scan its pages until we read the following immortal words:

"All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, namely, (the power and right of the people to establish government), and are of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of the party, often a small but artful enterprising minority of the community, and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common counsels and motivated by mutual interests . . .

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution. or modification of the constitutional power be in any particular wrong, **let it be corrected by an amendment in the way the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation."**

My fellow countrymen, I am glad that I have dared to speak. I am guilty of uttering, not sedition, but the words of the Father of my Country.

I recognize that "freedom slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent." I am conscious that from pre-historic days there has been a struggle for man to unshackle himself from the bondage of slavery of every type. Thus, posterity has built its monuments to a Moses, to a Pericles, to the Gracchi brothers, to a Gregory the Great, to a Stephen Langton and to a Washington. Scorners have arisen to disparage their fame. But the scorners have been crushed by the weight of the years.

In Washington's day all liberties gained by all the heroes of the past were assembled together. For the first time in the history of civilization the ideals of all government had been achieved. Link after link had been fabricated by Moses, by Pericles and by their companion heroes. It was Washington's function to weld them together in one solid chain which history shall refer to as the Constitution of the United States.

For more than 150 years it has been stretched across the frontiers of our country to repel the possible invasions of foreigners. For more than a century it has moored us to the immovable rock of reason. Hitherto the winds of passion and discontent have failed to cast us adrift. Lightning shafts of political rancor have battered hopelessly at our ship of state. Never once did it become a prey of the lashing waves of radicalism because the Constitution held fast and Americans who manned our decks clung tenaciously to that Constitution. Always it was regarded as the true safeguard of liberty—always, until today, when lovers of novelty are willing to destroy that Constitution as they prepare to set sail upon the red sea of dictatorship.

Forsake the Constitution and we forsake all liberty, even though some of us are prepared to barter it for a promise of new liberty!

In the words of Washington, if the Constitution must be corrected, "let it be corrected by an amendment in the way the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation."

Let me remind you that in the Declaration of Independence one of the charges against the dictator, George III, was that "He has made judges dependent upon his will alone, for the tenure of their offices." The greatest of all Americans, the founding fathers, risked their fortunes and their lives to back up this charge. Shall we repudiate their victories, their wounds, their sacrifices and their indomitable spirits, after 161 years, or shall we sustain them and still oppose any political descendant of George III "who makes judges dependent upon his will alone"?

If in these hectic days, when industrial strife is making its first tragic appearance, there is need for an amendment to the Constitution in order to legalize the existence of a federal law in behalf of labor, let there be an amendment of the Constitution performed in a constitutional manner. But, I repeat, let there be no government "by usurpation." That is intolerable.

The first Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, John Marshall, once remarked that, "The accumulation of all powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—in the same hands, whether of one, or few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elected, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

The most eminent constitutional mind which ever visited our shores, Lord Bryce of England, said some years ago:

"Suppose a Congress and president are bent on doing something which the Supreme Court deems contrary to the Constitution. They pass a statute. A case arises under it. The court, on hearing the case, unanimously declares the statute to be null, as being beyond the powers of Congress. Congress forthwith passes and the president signs another statute more than doubling the number of justices. The president appoints to the new justiceships men who are pledged to hold the former statute constitutional. The Senate confirms the appointments. Another case raising the validity of the disputed statute is brought up to the court. The new justices outvote the old ones, the statute is held valid; **the security provided for the protection of the Constitution is gone like a morning mist."**

And finally, the eminent Daniel Webster, supporting the admonition of Washington, exclaimed:

"Other misfortunes may be borne and their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen unto future harvests.

"But who can reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who can rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty, who can frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with states' rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again."

Marshall, Bryce and Webster I gladly quote for you in this sad hour when pigmy minds pay little heed to them and less to Washington and the Constitution which he loved.

Already two of Washington's admonitions were unheeded. In each case the price was paid for our defection. In the first case it was the blood price of the Civil War. In the second case we are still carrying the burden of Europe's debt and the heartaches of wounds which time can never heal as a result of the World War. His third admonition of preserving the Constitution, of preserving intact the independence of each branch of government—this is in the balance today. Our children will pay the price if we break faith with our founder.

I recall the historic days when the international-minded Napoleon sat out to dissolve all nationality. Every nation in Europe trembled before that scourge of God. From London, William Wordsworth spoke out bravely condemning the laxity which characterized his apathetic fellow citizens who were careless of the dangers which threatened them.

Lamenting the unpatriotic spirit which seemed to predominate, the great English poet addressed himself to the spirit of John Milton. Said he:

"The wealthiest man among us is the best . . .
. . . Rapine, avarice, expense,
This is idolatry; and these we adore.
Plain living and high thinking are no more.
. . . Altar, sword and pen,
Fireside . . . have forfeited their dower.
Oh! raise us up, return to us again."

We, too, in this sad hour, call upon the spirit of Washington to "raise us up and, return to us again."

Come, my fellow countrymen, arouse yourselves to action! As you look forward to better days to come, reach back into the holy past for direction. Hold high your banner of liberty. The spirit of Washington still leads us on. This year's suffering of Valley Forge shall pass away. The Delaware of discontent shall be crossed. This is still the country "of the people, by the people and for the people."

The Shrine of the Little Flower—1934!

Fraunce's Tavern—1783!

Reverently roll down the curtain of Time. Our visit to our beloved Father is finished. But 'eer we depart, let us take one last look!

Washington has finished speaking. His military comrades are rising to bid him farewell. Through the mists of time see them filing by their leader. Listen closely as he says: "I shall be obliged to you if each will come and take me by the hand."

Fellow countrymen, as you sit by your receiving set, close your eyes, lift up your hand! Clasp the hand of your beloved leader.

His hand holds your hand. It is a sacred pact between the living and the dead. It is your pledge to hold fast to the traditions!

Norman Holds Whip-Hand Over British Money Laws; Brother Is Radio Dictator

By the Financial Editor

The fact that every time Montagu Collet Norman makes one of his periodical "vacation" trips to the United States, something happens to our dollar, makes a thoughtful person inquire as to what manner of man he is.

Most of us know that he has been governor of the Bank of England since 1920, but, beyond that, he is a black-capped figure, gloating in the mystery in which he has enveloped himself, not unlike the late Sir Basil Zarahoff.

The British news-magazine, Cavalcade, for October, 1936, has the following sketch of the English banking czar.

Frederick Henry Norman, was a barrister who became a director of Martins bank and married the daughter of Sir Marks Wilke Collet, partner in the bank of Brown-Shipley and Company and a director and governor of the Bank of England.

Frederick Henry's son, Montagu Collet Norman, was not a bright scholar, left King's College, Cambridge after one year, and went straight into Brown-Shipley and Company, tucked away in Founders Court in Lothbury behind the Bank of England premises, when he was 19.

Apprenticeship Made Easy for Him

With his father on the board of directors, Montagu became a privileged apprentice, had no long grind on the bank ledgers, moved swiftly from one department to another to learn the business of banking.

The Brown-Shipley directors knew how to say "No!" to proposals which at first sight seemed attractive. The apprentice learned from them, and unlike his argumentative grandfather, he liked the secret conclaves. He seems early to have decided that financial matters were not fit subjects for public discussion.

The apprentice went to New York to study banking with domineering old James Brown, of the friendly New York banking firm of Brown Brothers and Company (now Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company), made some good and lasting connections, got acquainted with the American character and fell in love with New York.

Back at Brown-Shipley's in London, he became a partner in 1900, when he was only 29. In 1907, he was elected a director of the Bank of England, representing Brown-Shipley's interests at the Bank Court.

He Heads Famous Bank of England

Before the World war, the bank's governors were automatically elected for a period of two years; their job was not whole time, and permanent bank officials handled the well-oiled routine.

The war changed that.

In 1915 Montagu Norman was elected deputy governor, the late Lord Cunliffe was governor throughout the war, and the 5 per cent war loan was floated.

In 1920 Lord Cunliffe died, and Montagu Norman, still a bachelor, looking more the artist than the typical heavy-jowled banker, became governor. He was faced with a whole-time job, severed his interest with Brown-Shipley, suffered a sharp drop in salary to the bank's 200 pounds.

Thus at 49, he became the financial dictator of England. The Bank of England is a privately chartered and privately controlled company. The government cannot touch its policy.

Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England. To members of parliament, he's a modern Tallyrand, but London reporters call him "Professor Skinner." —*Keystone.*

Directors Set Bank Rate Daily

Directors of the Bank of England meet every Thursday at 11 a. m. Surrounded by an atmosphere of hush-hush, they decide the bank rate, which is posted up by a swank clerk from the secretary's office at 2:30 p. m. for the money-brokers' runners waiting impatiently in the cold corridors while the directors themselves lunch handsomely on a meal prepared by the bank's housekeeper and cooks.

In the evening, the bank property from the roof down is patrolled by a platoon of guards with bayoneted rifles.

To the autocratic, secretive personality of Governor Montagu Norman, this was the perfect stage setting.

In the Financial Court of the Bank of England, Governor Norman held complete sway over the directors. He would rap impatiently on the table when private conversations between the inattentive directors became too loud.

Long Known as The "Silent Bachelor"

Bankers and the treasury officials found him accessible, calm, friendly, a man who glided calmly through tricky financial discussions, never appeared to be ruffled, informed them of the decisions of the Bank of England as though he was quoting an oracle.

To the public, on the other hand, he became a mystery man. He was called the "silent bachelor," and when he took young Stanley Baldwin, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, over to New York and saddled England with a whacking war debt to the United States, the public came to regard him as the arch-demon of finance, as elusive as the wind.

The Bank of England has no publicity office. Newspaper financial editors have to make polite unofficial visits to get news in the form of prepared "handouts."

Thoroughly Enjoys Role of Mystery

In London newspapers, Norman is characterized as "Professor Skinner," taken from the name of his secretary, and he is often depicted as leaping from motor launches, tripping up the sides of ocean liners in sudden mysterious visits to the United States and the continent as well. However, when he is questioned about something personal, he has been known to change as completely as Dr. Jekyl was transformed into Mr. Hyde. Newshawks, endeavoring to interview him on his journeys have to catch him on the fly, as he bolts in the familiar black cape and soft hat.

Montagu Norman thoroughly enjoys this role of mystery man. The opera buffe publicity tickles his vanity, **but he strongly objects to anyone finding out the facts behind his missions.**

To criticism, however, he is completely indifferent. It slips off his back like the water off a duck's and he walks abroad without escort. With his hat at a rakish angle, he drops into the Treasury or to visit the House of Commons. On Budget Day, he sits in the Distinguished Stranger's Gallery and listens. Afterwards, he goes behind the speaker's chair into the chancellor's room to congratulate him on his speech—the mimicing is usually excellent—and discusses finance. He has done this for many years.

Marries Belgian Major's Daughter

In 1933, the "silent bachelor" who had put England back on the gold standard in 1925, and had fought hard against it coming off in 1931, renounced the title of bachelor, and married slim, gracious Priscilla Reyntiens.

Following the war, he helped organize the Bank of International Settlements at Basle, Switzerland, extended credits from the Bank of England to a number of Central Banks throughout Europe—at a price of course—while the League of Nations hemmed and hawed at Geneva.

The governor is more active in adjusting international finance abroad than in fostering British industry at home. One move in the latter direction having been the founding of the Bankers' Industrial Development Company and the Securities Management Trust, Limited, to both of which he is chairman.

In spite of the promising title, the former has done little to develop industry. Founded principally to help the iron, steel and cotton manufacturers to reorganize in a new attempt to capture foreign markets, results have so far been disappointing, because, according to the bankers, the industries have shown a reluctance to set their house in order. No doubt the terms of the Bank of England were a little too steep even for big business. This endeavor was a side issue with Montagu Norman and recently he withdrew his support.

Brother Is Czar Of British Radio

His brother, Ronald C. Norman is head of the British Broadcasting Company. Thus the Bank of England is able effectively to control the government radio. On week-ends, Norman often goes to his brother's estate at Much Hadam, Hertfordshide, where there is a cottage kept specially for him. Here he can relax, wander through the woods, of which is very fond, and chip away at his hobby of carpentry.

Montagu Norman commutes between Campden Hill and his bank station by train and when he appears at the top of the tube station, traffic is held up on the street while the familiar figure sweeps across to the main entrance of the Bank of England.

It is not unusual when the international financial situation is ticklish for him to confer at midnight with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Treasury officials, but always he is cool and calm no matter how disturbing the situation may be.

Former King Edward VIII, w was deposed by Norman and oth bankers because he was too frien with the exploited people.

—*Acme Pict*

Montag Black-C

A few partners of Norman in the international confraternity of money changers. Above are M. Labeyrie (left) governor of the Bank of Paris, and Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, governor of Germany's Reichsbank. Below are three American confederates of Norman (l-r) Thomas W. Lamont, George Whitney and J. P. Morgan.

Montagu Norman is an art lover. When he isn't devoting his talents to the art of making money, he recreates in London picture galleries. —*Acme Picture.*

u Norman--England's Cloaked Mystery Man

—*Acme Picture.*



—*Wide World.*



Tweedledum, past and present. Stanley Baldwin, former Chancellor of the British Exchequer (right), and Neville Chamberlain, the current chancellor. Norman refers to the relations of the Bank of England and the Exchequer as those of "Tweedledee and Tweedledum." The chancellors dance when Norman cracks the whip. —*Acme Picture.*

Norman Heads the 'Secret Nine,' Openly Boasts He Is Above Law

Montagu Norman, high lord of British finance, is England's impresario of that axiom of international banking set forth by the House of Rothschild — "Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation and I care not who makes its laws."

As governor of the Bank of England, Norman is the boss of those money changers behind the parliament who meet in secret, who never disclose their decisions, who never brag about their authority, and who nonetheless tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer what he may do or what he may not do.

More than this, by his close association with wealthy bankers throughout the world, Montagu Norman is able to influence banking legislation in other countries.

Asked what were the relations of the Bank of England and the Exchequer (the British treasury), Norman once said: "They are the relations of Tweedledee and Tweedledum." But he now claims that while the treasury is responsible to parliament, the bank is not.

Only two men of the secret nine Bank of England officials who comprise the supreme court of their nation's monetary policies are generally known — Norman, and his deputy, Basil Gage Catterns.

Norman, Catterns and their seven confederates are able to dictate the economic destinies of the British people, though they are elected from among themselves and are technically responsible to no one.

These men are Britain's dictators.

Through the money issue, which they control, and the bank rate, which they decide, they can make credit plentiful or restricted, borrowing cheap or expensive—just as do the Federal Reserve bankers of the United States.

The only ones in England who dare to over-rule Montagu Norman are news photographers. Here he is shown attempting to prevent a camera man from taking his picture. —*Acme Picture.*

Montagu Norman, the head man of this international bank clique, once had the audacity to declare publicly:

"Those for whom I speak welcome the freedom which we have in comparison with those in many other markets, but we wish to use that freedom in the only proper way it can be used, and that is in harmony with the government's policy. I assure the ministers that if they will make known through the appropriate channels what they wish us to do in the furtherance of their policies they will at all times find us willing to do what they direct **as though we were under legal compulsion."**

Ponder his words closely, for this is what Norman meant:

"I, Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England, do claim equal sovereignty with parliament.

"When it suits me to do so I will go along with the policy of the ministers—but please observe that I and my fellow bankers shape that policy before parliament even utters it."

Demand for One Big Union Splits Labor's Solidarity

By the Labor Editor of SOCIAL JUSTICE

If a cross-section survey were made among those leaders best qualified to speak for American labor, what would be the consensus with respect to John L. Lewis's activities in the C. I. O. drive?

This question recently was put to a nationally known labor figure who has been active for many years as a trade unionist, and who leans over backward to be fair in his views His answer was:

"Those who are sincerely interested in the cause of labor in this country look with mixed emotions on the strike-organization campaign of Lewis. Whether they actually say so or not, they want him to win. They fear a wave of exploitation by industrial employers if he loses.

"On the other hand, these leaders are asking themselves, 'What will happen if he wins?' And they shudder a great deal more at the prospect of that development. For Lewis is a bold threat to the traditional democracy of union organization. His dictatorship of the United Mine Workers would undoubtedly spread over the whole of unionized labor."

Lewis Demands One Big Union

What Lewis demands as the result of his current drive is the recognition of one big union embracing all the workers in the auto industry, for instance, just as in the coal mines, where, in most cases, he has succeeded in making the United Mine Workers of America the sole labor union.

The common belief, however, that the American Federation of Labor is purely an organization of craft unions is not founded in fact. The federation long has recognized that industrial unions were best adapted to certain industries.

But—and this is the argument of Lewis and his followers—the federation hasn't shown enough enterprise in organizing these "certain industries."

There is a lot of truth in the recent statement of the radical Adolph Germer, one of Lewis' key agitators in the Flint auto strike. Germer said the A. F. of L. executive council lacked "the broad social aim of lifting the underpaid masses" and further charged:

"The A. F. of L. is controlled by a labor aristocracy of the highly skilled and highly paid crafts that has little regard for the unskilled and underpaid workers of industry."

The federation answers that it has encouraged the formation of mass unions whenever practical and points to the fact that Mr. Lewis' own union, the United Mine Workers of America, became industrial with the approval and assistance of the A. F. of L.

A. F. L. Made Room For Industrial Unions

Another union, besides the Mine Workers, to be granted an "industrial" charter by the federation, was the United Automobile Workers, the spearhead of the C. I. O. titan's strike forces at the present time.

Lewis' argument with Green is that experience has shown—that industrial and craft unionism cannot exist together in the same factory because the jurisdiction of the one invariably trespasses on the jurisdiction of the other.

The federation comes back with the contention that it is unfair to skilled workmen to be placed in the same general classification and under the same jurisdiction as unskilled laborers.

The stand taken by SOCIAL JUSTICE since the craft-industrial union feud began has been that mass unionism is the best possible form of labor organization in certain industries.

Vertical unions has unquestioned merit in industries where the differences between working groups are not great—such as the mine industry, or the oil industry. Not so in the skilled trades of the auto industry. Here the C. I. O. has undertaken the gargantuan task of regimenting under one union control all workers, whether they be master mechanics, service men, welders, engineers, machine operators, foundrymen and the host of othrs that compose the typical auto plant payroll. It simply cannot be done with equal justice for all.

Speaking before the last A. F. of L. convention in Tampa, Fla., John C. Frey, president of the Metal Trades unions, charged that Lewis' lieutenants were openly inducing craft unionists to secede and become members of industrial, or vertical, factions.

Historic Background Of Union Break

Concerning the activities of the leaders of the auto workers' industrial union, also allied with Lewis, Frey declared:

"The United Automobile Workers have not only gone far afield from their grant of jurisdiction by the A. F.of L. in their organizing activity, but have also gone far afield from the auto industry itself. Its organizers are carrying on campaigns in machine shops, jobbing and contract shops, and tool and die shops which have no connection whatever, or only a remote connection, with the production of automobiles."

The battle between craft and industrial unions reached an open break after skirmishes that date back more than 30 years.

The history of the controversy leading up to the final break may be recorded briefly as follows:

1934—The San rancisco convention of the A. F. of L. adopts a report favoring a change in policy to permit the organization of the majority of workers in mass production industries along industrial rather than craft lines.

C. I. O. in Bid for Mass Workers

October, 1935—Atlantic City convention of the A. F. of L. reaffirms the San Francisco resolution. But Lewis is dissatisfied, claiming that the executive council of the federation had taken no actual steps in behalf of industrial unionism.

November, 1935 — Lewis resigns from the executive council, forms the Committee for Industrial Organization to do what he said the federation had failed to do—that is, to concentrate on the organization of mass production workers into one big union.

January, 1936—Executive council requests that the C. I. O. dissolve.

May, 1936—Executive council issues ultimatum to the C. I. O. to disband. Lewis ignores it.

August, 1936—A. F. of L. decides to suspend C. I. O. unions if they do not renounce their separate entity by September 5.

September 5, 1936—Lewis and his partisans ignore the ultimatum and the suspension of their unions becomes effective.

The 10 unions suspended were:

Lewis Unions Are Thrown Out

United Mine Workers of America—John L. Lewis, president.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—Sidney Hillman, president.

Oil Field, Gas Well and Refinery Workers of America—Harvey C. Fremming, president.

International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers — Thomas H. Brown, president.

United Textile Workers of America—Thomas F. McMahon, president.

Federation of Flat Glass Workers of America—Glenn McCabe, president.

Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers—M. F. Tighe, president.

International Union United Automobile Workers of America —Homer Martin, president.

United Rubber Workers of America—S. H. Dalrymple, president.

International Ladies' Garment Workers Union — David Dubinsky, president.

These unions had comprised about 40 per cent of the A. F. of L.'s total membership, controlled 10,000 of the 30,000 convention votes, numbered about 1,000,000 members, and contributed around $10,000 in monthly dues.

What reason does Lewis give for the establishment of the Committee for Industrial Organization?

The answer is found in the first pamphlet issued by the committee:

"Because of the urgency of organizing the unorganized in the basic industries of America, the Committee for Industrial Organization has been formed. Its purpose is to encourage and promote such organization in mass production and other industries upon an industrial basis."

Senate Quiz Exposes GM Union Spies

The LaFollette Civil Liberties committee in the United States senate is fast at work gathering labor espionage evidence which, it is thought, will result in legislation to outlaw the employment of industrial spies and strikebreakers by large corporations.

Among the several startling facts already uncovered, through adroit questioning of Pinkerton Detective Agency officials, is the revelation that General Motors corporation paid nearly a million dollars for confidential information obtained by sleuths in regard to labor union activities.

The senate inquiry did not act quickly enough to seize certain files in the offices of General Motors executives. Harry W. Anderson, chief of labor relations for the auto concern, testified that the files of certain GM officials had been stripped of reports made by Anderson's department.

Anderson testified that he had personally gone through the files of William S. Knudsen and C. E. Wilson, officials of General Motors. The files of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., president, also were rifled of similar labor reports in the nick of time.

"Why did you destroy the reports?" Senator LaFollette inquired.

"Because of the investigation," Anderson admitted.

The senate committee also brought out that the General Motors management, not content with collecting evidence of union activities in its own plants, directed the "Pinks" to spy on a detective agency used by the Chrysler corporation, known as the "Corporation Auxiliary Company."

So far, the investigation has disclosed that three-quarters of the detectives hired by these large corporations are members of the United Automobile Workers' union, their dues paid by the agencies. The spying members reported the proceedings of union meetings to the employers. One of the spies was paid to accompany a union leader on his vacation, to sound him out on his views about the labor situation.

The reason given by General Motors officials for spying on the Chrysler agency was that they "hoped to locate the source of a series of leaks from the General Motors engineering department."

Labor Highlights

WASHINGTON, D. C.—John L. Lewis ousts William Green, A. F. of L. president, from his United Mine Workers Union for saying that Lewis "surrendered" in the auto strike.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—Threat to start another maritime strike hangs over Pacific coast ports after officials of three maritime unions wire President Roosevelt that commerce "will again be paralyzed" unless enforcement of the Copeland safety-at-sea act is delayed . . . Act provides seamen must carry books showing records of their employment and ability . . . Unions declare this information furnishes employers with opportunity to "black-list" union workers.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Critical labor situation facing the administration is further aggravated by a threatened coal mine strike led by John L. Lewis . . . Trouble looms over insistence of Lewis United Mine Workers that employers apply existing "check-off" system (collecting union dues out of pay envelopes) to additional assessments on UMWA members . . . Mine wage contracts with operators expire in the spring and Lewis is expected to use this issue in his plans to call out the miners at that time.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas, after introducing bill to strengthen regulation of child labor by states, says: "As I stated when I introduced the measure, I do not believe such legislation can fully meet the situation. The real answer is in ratification of the child labor amendment, and such proposed legislation as I have just mentioned is only a stopgap until congress is empowered to meet the situation on a national scale."

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Republicans under Senator Vandenberg of Michigan move to revise Social Security Act by legislation requiring the security board to report before May 1, 1937, why a "pay-as-you-go" policy should not be substituted for present procedure of creating a $47-billion reserve fund .

The Real Strike Winners

The big winners in the first round of the auto strike were the du Pont brothers, chief stockholders of the General Motors corporation. Shown here, left to right, are Felix, Irenee, Lamont (chairman of the GM board of directors), and Pierre du Pont. *—Wide World.*

DuPonts Take First Round of G.M. Union Strike Battle

Stripped of its fanfarish interpretations, and viewed in the cold light of reality, the auto strike settlement treaty constitutes a major victory for the large stockholders of the General Motors corporation and a defeat for those workers, both union and non-union, who were involved in the dispute.

The effects of the motor strike may be summarized briefly as follows:

(1) General Motors stock was further concentrated in the hands of the du Ponts and other wealthy share-holders in the corporation. The stock was forced down in price during the 43 days of the strike, enabling the du Pont trust to buy cheaply;

(2) John L. Lewis suffered a setback in his plans to empower his United Auto Workers with sole collective bargaining privileges with the management;

(3) The union issue split the forces of organized labor wider apart than ever and left American labor, now virtually leaderless, at the mercy of exploiting industrial employers;

(4) Approximately 100,000 General Motors employes were granted a 5 cents-an-hour increase in wages as a result of the strike. The workers were out 43 days. Estimating the average pay of each workman at $5 a day, he lost about $215 in earnings while he was idle. In other words, **it will take him 537 days to earn back what he lost as a result of the strike!**

A Sham Battle

The strike itself was but a sham battle between John L. Lewis and the General Motors management, both of whom were using the workers as pawns in their own plans.

Other than the stock profits made by wealthy GM owners, it is difficult to determine what was accomplished by the 43-day tie-up of the country's largest motor corporation.

The agreement on the part of the management not to negotiate (unless otherwise obtaining the approval of Governor Murphy) with any other group of employes in the strike-affected plants for a period of six months is palpably a sop for Mr. Lewis' wounded feelings.

Lewis Backs Down

The New York Times, analyzing the import of the six-month agreement, comments editorially:

"This is plainly a face-saving device for Mr. Lewis, to gloss over the fact that on the essential point of employee-representation, he has gained no more in the end than the company was prepared to offer him a month ago, in the early days of the strike.

"By Mr. Lewis' own choice, the question of employe-representation was the supreme issue of the strike, so overshadowing in its importance that during the conferences it was debated to the exclusion of all else In the end Mr. Lewis was forced to abandon it because his position had become increasingly untenable."

Minority to Bargain

The General Motors corporation agreed to bargain collectively only with the membership of the United Auto Workers union in the next six months. In other words, Lewis' union will enjoy representation based on the number of its members and will not be vested with the right to represent all General Motors employes.

This is plainly a defeat for Lewis on the major demand of his union in the strike—to be empowered as the "sole" bargaining agency in the plants of the corporation. It is a setback for him in his first effort to establish his industrial union program in an important mass production industry.

The United Auto Workers group is estimated to control about a 20 per cent minority of the total workers employed in the 69 plants of the General Motors company. Homer Martin, president, and other officials of the union have already begun to confer with GM officials on the "proportionate representation" basis set forth in the six month truce.

Martin's demands, first made on the company January 5, include a 30-hour week, abolition of all piecework, and an unspecified minimum pay rate.

William S. Knudson, vice-president of General Motors, will head the group bargaining for his corporation.

Statements on the need for better methods of settling such disputes as the auto strike have come from several prominent sources since the termination of the "sit down" affair in Flint.

The nearest approach to a national policy governing labor representation is the principle embodied in the Wagner Act, now before the Supreme Court. But the Wagner Act rejects the principle of proportional representation, and provides that a majority of workers shall constitute the exclusive bargaining agency in an industrial unit.

This feature of the Wagner Act is vastly unfair and (like most other New Deal legislation) undemocratic in that it deprives a minority of employes of rightful representation and coerces this minority against its will.

AUTO STRIKE BOX SCORE

As the dust clears away from the strike-embattled auto plants of the General Motors corporation, the following settlement features and effects stand out in relief:

The du Ponts and other big stockholders of the General Motors corporation have scored a major victory—first, by managing to gain greater control of the corporation through the unsettled condition of the market during the strike; secondly, by subduing the attempt of John L. Lewis to set his union up as the sole bargaining agency for General Motors employes.

Each worker rendered idle by the strike lost on the average of $215 in wages during the 43 days of the sit-down. Workers received a meagre 5 cents-an-hour increase in wages but, at this rate, they will have to work 537 days to earn back the $215.

Organized labor is split asunder, with John L. Lewis and William Green contesting for control, but with no one leader on the scene capable of composing differences and welding the two factions together.

Lewis suffered defeat in his plans to win for the United Auto Workers union the status of "exclusive" bargaining agent for all workers in General Motors plants.

The corporation agreed to grant only proportionate representation to the Lewis union, limiting its bargaining power to its membership. Bargaining on this basis is to proceed for six months.

—Acme Picture.

General Motors management agreed not to negotiate with other labor groups during tenure of six months' agreement without approval of Governor Murphy.

"Sit down" method takes on aspect of permanency in future strike procedure, making the Communistic principle of property seizure a cardinal principle of John L. Lewis' program of industrial warfare.

Demands that the Wagner Labor Act be revised to cope with the situation come from Edward F. McGrady and others, who say that there is no law to deal with "sit-downing."

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor and a bitter foe of Lewis, charged terms of settlement amount to "surrender" by Lewis.

Corporation promised not to exercise "discrimination" or "prejudices" against any employe because of union activities or affiliations.

Union agrees that pending further negotiations there shall be no strikes called or any other interruption to production on the part of members until "all opportunities to achieve a satisfactory settlement" have been exhausted. Union further promised there shall be "no attempts to intimidate or coerce any employes" and "no solicitation or signing up of members on the premises of the company."

Corporation quashed injunction proceedings instituted by the corporation against the "sit-downers."

Facts Support Social Justice Story on King

(Continued from Page 1)

writing, American newspapers have refused to publish the story.

This latest development is reported to be of such serious import that Baldwin is ready to hand in his resignation to the cabinet. Indeed, a news item intended to prepare the public for this was released to the news services to the effect that Mr. Baldwin "hopes to retire" immediately after the coronation.

Mr. Carter's broadcast, reproduced elsewhere in this edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE, tells the American people how Edward's relief plan for England's poor was secretly "pigeon-holed" by the Minister of Agriculture to whom it was presented. It remained carefully shelved until a few days ago when knowledge of Edward's final action began to leak out through the inner circles of the government, and the demand of the people compelled the minister to reveal the ex-king's plan.

Censor Stopped Plan to "Tell All"

Edward planned to "tell all" when, after his abdication, he spoke as a private citizen in a radio message to the people of the empire. But on the very day of his abdication a "gag" was clamped down upon the British Broadcasting Company, headed by the brother of Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England!

This censorship specifically prevented Edward or any of his champions — Winston Churchill, Lord Beaverbrook or Lord Rothmere—from "going to the people" over the heads of the ministry. The English king's farewell address, cut from an intended hour to a few brief moments, was "electric" with the ominous things that were left unsaid.

Edward first caused apprehension among the international banking oligarchy by openly criticizing the government for its slowness in meeting the depression emergency, and by promising the people that he "would do something" about their condition as soon as he came to the throne.

He was a likable and popular ruler and in an excellent position to make himself a dictator-king and break the power of the world bankers. The cabinet feared that he was determined to do this very thing and decided to remove him before the situation got out of hand.

His announced intention to marry Mrs. Simpson gave them the opportunity they were seeking.

5c per copy

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Father Coughlin's Weekly Review

Produce For Use At a Fair Profit

Volume II No. 22 Royal Oak, Michigan December 21, 1936

KING'S LOVE IS PAWN IN A BANKERS' PLOT

December 21, 1936 SOCIAL JUSTICE

(Story on page 3)

King Promised to Relieve Poor, Ministers Order He Must Go

EYES EARS Wages Lag Under Rising

His Majesty, King George VI

Love Affair Only a Pawn in Bank Plot

By Justin Sorel

The abdication of King Edward VIII of England signifies a new "Norman conquest" for the British. A strong-willed Windsor, who had left it be known that he was a friend of the suffering people, is dis-

Reproduced from the edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE dated December 21, 1936, these headlines disclosed an exclusive story to America. Reluctant official admission that the young king's program for relief of the poor was behind the ouster now comes from London, but bank-controlled newspapers have not dared to divulge the facts.

Ministers Tried to Bury Edward's Plan for Relief

(Continued from Page 1)

a very short time after he had visited one of the distressed areas in the mining section in Wales and declared bluntly: "Something shall and must be done about this!" that Britain's old guard ganged up against him and forced the Simpson issue into the immediate foreground.

Thus it is revealed now by News Review that the day before he sailed from England, bound for Austria, Edward, forced into an impossible position by the puritanical Baldwin, sat up most of his last night on his native soil, going over details of a huge, vast scheme of relief for Britain's poor in their distressed areas, which had been brought to him privately at Fort Belvedere.

Sent Relief Plan To Government

Having examined them minutely, he okayed them and then sent them on to his government. Then he departed for the continent of Europe, no doubt with a certain contentment of soul that one of his very last acts, unheralded, unsung and unknown at the time, had been to help the poor and the starved — in whose welfare he always was supremely interested and on whose behalf he had had many tilts and hot words with Britain's old guard. It was this interest that caused many to shake their heads and prophesy that he would be England's first socialistic king.

It was the thing which caused Baldwin and his supporting cast of pious and pedigreed pilgrims such undercover alarm. His recommendations went to the Ministry of Agriculture, where they were quietly interred in a ready pigeon-hole, the government hoping fondly that these, like Edward's memory, would soon be covered by the dust of forgetfulness of the popular British mind in the passage of time.

But the news of Edward's eleventh hour labors on the relief plan leaked out. People soon began to bombard the government for details.

Engineer Gave Edward Plan

The vexed officials went to the pigeon-hole, pulled out the ex-king's plans and began to give them honest and serious consideration.

The outline of the plan came to Edward through a one-time guards officer, Morton Travers. Mining in Siberia in 1908 attracted so many jobless men who wanted work that he had worked out a land settlement scheme, based on the communal principal. Many of the jobless who came flocking to this English mining engineer could hardly walk, so emaciated were they from starvation.

In thirty days, he found 3,500 men of more than a dozen nationalities on his hands. So he organized a scheme to feed, clothe and care for them. Twenty-eight years later, this Englishman wondered why the same scheme he worked so successfully a quarter of a century ago in the wild wastes of Siberia couldn't be made to operate in England's distressed areas.

The scheme was taken to Edward . He worked over it, ironed out rough edges, inserted some of his own ideas, approved it—the night before he left England and sent it to his own government.

It is reported today that Prime Minister Baldwin has definitely made up his mind to resign as Britain's prime minister immediately after the coronation fripperies of George VI.

Staff Writer Face to Face With Flood

(Continued from Page 5)

all the women and children were sent from the city to outlying points of safety. The men remained to elevate and strengthen the levee on which the hopes of the entire city were centered.

We docked in Cairo late one afternoon and I took the liberty to walk around the levee both on the Ohio and the Mississippi side. The swift current created huge waves which splashed against the sides of this temporary construction.

Not being acquainted with engineering I feared the water would either come over the top or the levee would break. I voiced my fears to the men doing the actual work and they seemed equally confident that the flood crest would neither come to the top nor would the levee break at any point. Time proved they were right.

Most people will never know the long hours, the continuous days and nights without rest that these men from Cairo spent in work and watchfulness. Never for a moment was the levee left unguarded. Sand bags upon sand bags were used in this work and hour after hour, day after day, the workmen watched with wary eye the rise of the pounding Ohio on their left and the Mississippi on their right.

But these heroes of Cairo won their fight, a fight to save their homes and their possessions from the cruel rampage of uncontrolled nature.

Home Is Home, Refuse to Leave

As our steamboat went chugging on down the Mississippi on its mission of helpfulness, past the isolated farm houses, one of the sailors on board noticed signs of life on a small farm. We cautiously approached the farm house. Picture in your mind this farm as I saw it: Water within two inches of the second floor, an old couple, I should judge around 65, huddled in a corner of one of the second floor rooms, two chickens walking around the room, a shivering lamb, no food, no water and no heat.

The doctor from the boat climbed into the house through a second floor window with every intention of removing the occupants to a nearby city, but to his surprise the old people refused to leave. They were threatened, every means of persuasion was used, but to them that was home, the only home they knew and they were not going to leave it. Threats were to no avail, promises were futile. So after giving them food and water we left them there.

To you who read these words it may seem heartless but had you seen these old folks you could understand that life would not have been worth living for them in any other place. That was their home and there they meant to stay, come what would.

Coast Guard Rescue In Hotel Basement

About 8 p. m. one Sunday a big truck pulled up in front of the Vendome hotel in Evansville.

On the truck was a flat bottomed skiff and a crew of Coast Guard sailors.

The sailors climbed off the truck, lifted off the boat, and marched into the hotel lobby and thence downstairs where they launched the boat in the flooded basment.

Beams from flashlights revealed a shivering bull terrier on a door floating on the black water, crying like a baby in pain.

The Coast Guardsmen navigated out to the door, removed the dog, and set it on the stairway, then picked up their boat and marched out of the hotel.

The dog, a refugee from Newburgh, was adopted by William P. McCulley, telephone repair man.

Flood Chased New Harmony Man

A. C. Thomas of New Harmony, Ind., insists that he is not a refugee but an "evacuator," and an experienced one at that.

When the first threat of flood was shouted about the level Wabash river valley, Mr. Thomas decided that it was time to leave his happy home.

"And where," asked Mr. Thomas to himself, "is a safer place to move than Evansville? Evansville never has floods."

Mr. Thomas moved to Evansville. Flood waters crept up to his Evansville home and Mr. Thomas moved again; and again.

Now he's back in New Harmony.

Duty First to Telephone Operator

One of the instances of devotion to duty during the flood emergency came to light at Earlington, Ky.

Miss Frances Huff, day operator for the telephone company, was on duty at the switchboard handling dozens of calls for railroad passengers marooned in her city.

Then came a call that her father, Joe Huff, former Earlington resident, had died suddenly in Hopkinsville, where he was visiting.

Miss Huff remained at the switchboard putting through the many calls until her chief operator could find a substitute.

There could never be a sufficient reward for loyalty such as this.

He Used Boat To Go Visiting

Cincinnati police received a report that a man calling for help was floating down the flooded Ohio river in a small rowboat. A little later Coast Guardsmen saw their man and put out in a surf boat to rescue him.

"Grab hold," they shouted. "We'll save you."

"I don't want to be saved," the man shouted back, **"I'm on my way to Madison, Ind., to see relatives."**

The People Speak . . . .

Corporations And Greed

To the Editor:

After reading the January 11th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, noting the articles in regard to corporations, labor and the farmer, I feel impelled to voice my personal opinions in regard to corporations and their effects upon both labor and the farmer.

Charters, or articles of incorporation, are granted by the various states to from three to five men who by common consent conclude that they wish to incorporate and carry on business as a corporation.

By virtue of the rights and privileges granted to them, they issue and sell certificates of stock, from a few shares to millions. Purchasers of these shares of stock automatically become the financial backers of the corporation. To the stockholders the management of the corporation gives first consideration.

Bear in mind that share-holders want dividends and more dividends, and the management is never allowed to forget their wants.

Competitive concerns want business and intend to keep what they have and will not allow a new rival to step in and take this from them peaceably. Various tactics are resorted to—price cutting usually. When prices are cut time after time, something must be utilized to offset the difference thus lost between cost of production and the selling price to realize a profit large enough to satisfy the large stockholders especially.

There are three ways to do this: cut wages, install labor-saving machinery, or buy raw materials for less. The first two have the same result as far as labor is concerned. The third sometimes affects the profits of some other business. In all cases, it is the factory and farm laborer who bears the burden, often to the point of perpetual poverty, or, what is worse, revolution resulting in chaos.

To date, millions of shareholders have been sitting smugly contented while labor and agriculture have been going through hell—complaining, to be sure, but carrying on with the hope that the tomorrow which never comes would bring relief.

Corporations have been enthroned, wealth concentrated in the hands of a few.

—George Root.

Toledo, Ohio.

Kosciusko Famed As Poland's Lincoln

To the Editor:

On February 12 we commemorated the birth of two great men—Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko. The coincidence of joint commemoration is in accord with the similarities in character of these two immortals. Both were of the people, and both devoted their lives to the interests of the people.

Lincoln rose to one of the highest positions of honor in the history of mankind. He lived at a time of his country's crisis. An iron will, prompted by good judgment and a pure soul, directed the nation through a terrific storm into the sunshine of happiness and the settled waters of prosperity. His wisdom in time became the property and the solace of all huamnity. Lincoln's name is known throughout the civilized world, and his reputation as a plain man of genius, honesty and integrity will live forever.

Kosciusko, one of Washington's ablest generals, was the first European soldier of distinction to heed the call of freedom and cross the stormy seas in 1776, having preceded Lafayette by a year. He came not because he sought fortune or because he hated the British, but because he loved freedom. That cannot be said of many others. Many foreign officers deserted or asked for leave of absence. Many brilliant native officers had their grievances, real or imaginary. Benedict Arnold, a brilliant soldier, tried to betray the very place that Kosciusko fortified with such difficulty.

The philosophy of Lincoln's Gettysburg address should be brought repeatedly to our minds here at home and to the attention of the whole world.

Just as Lincoln laid stress on the immortality of his country, so did Kosciusko speak of Poland after the rising. "When," said he, "the Polish nation called me to defend the integrity, the independence, the dignity, the glory and the liberty of the country, she knew well that I was not the last Pole, and that with my death on the battlefield or elsewhere, Poland could not, must not, end."

If we study their lives and profit by them, we will become more virtuous as individuals and as a nation.

Stanley Michael Brya.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Reader Backs Fight for Truth

To the Editor:

I have been a reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE since its first edition. Its truth is so different from the information which comes to us through the columns of the daily press.

We need honesty and sincerity most in our country today, and that is what Father Coughlin has had the courage to stand before all and fight for.

We wish Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE much success and prosperity!

—M. Connor.

Auburn, N. Y.

Cost of the World's Wars Comes Out of Your Pockets

To the Editor:

In a previous issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, you suggested the job, for some Einstein, to figure out the cost of war so that the common people could fully comprehend it.

I am no Einstein, you may be sure, but I have done a little bit of arithmetic upon some of these billions that everybody is talking about.

The cost (silver) of the last war is estimated at $250-billion.

An American silver dollar weighs one ounce and is 1½ inches in diameter, being one-tenth of an inch thick.

So — $250-billion at 16 ounces to the pound equal 7,812,000 tons at 2,000 pounds to a ton. To transport such an amount would require 3,906 trains of 40 cars each, or a total of 156,240 cars, each carrying 50 tons. Each train would be a third of a mile long, 1,760 feet, and the total length of the 3,906 trains coupled together end to end would be 1,302 miles long.

29-Mile Silver Belt for Earth

250-billion laid edge to edge in a continuous line would extend a distance of 5,918,560 miles, or over 236 times the circumference of the earth. This amount of silver would be sufficient to belt the earth at the equator with a silver girdle over 29 feet wide and the thickness of a silver dollar.

This vast sum, if drawn into wire weighing 30 pounds per mile, would be sufficient to run six lines from the earth to the sun. The sun is 92,500,000 miles distant.

This vast sum, if rolled into railroad rails weighing 90 pounds per yard, would be ample to construct a standard-gauge silver-rail railroad 49,321 miles, which is about twice the distance around the earth at the equator.

This vast sum, if built into a column 10 feet square, would have its top far above the clouds—indeed, far above our atmosphere. It would reach an altitude of 325,520 feet, or nearly 62 miles.

This vast sum, if piled one dollar upon another, would reach over 394,560 miles above the earth, which is the distance from the earth to the moon and two-thirds the distance back to the earth. The moon is about 240,000 miles distant.

$170 Apiece For Everybody!

This vast sum, if divided equally among the entire population of the earth, would allow each man, woman and child about $170.

If a man gave away $200 every minute of the day and night without one second of interruption, it would require 2,378 years, 85 days, 13 hours and 20 minutes to dispense with this vast sum of money.

And the world is in more danger and less safe, and far less democratic, than it was in 1914!

According to Mr. Charles A. Beard, historian, our man-made depression has cost these United States at least $400-billion in lost productive power. That is nearly four times as much as the World war cost our nation in money.

How long will it take the people to realize that if they are to be delivered from their present situation of indifference and ignorance, they must do it themselves or perish?

—Chas. O. Francis.

Coulter, Pa.

There's a Sane Way to Fight Red Communism

To the Editor:

There are "reasonable" Communists who believe in their doctrines and mind their own business. They do not do much preaching on street corners, nor do they stir up strife and discontent among people who do not really know the first thing about Communism and couldn't stand it if they had a dose of it. They don't start strikes or lead parades. But there is a kind of Communist who does all these things, and nobody knows quite what to do about it. Nothing is gained by putting him in jail, and hitting him over the head is equally poor policy, for everyone knows that rough treatment is no remedy for revolution.

The cure for Communism is to allow labor fair treatment and a share in what it earns. **It can be laid down as a law of human nature that nobody gives up a good job to join a revolution.** To put the lid down tight on the revolutionary spirit and sit on it is no cure for Communism, and the American industrialist who believes in that sort of thing is only weaving a rope for his own hanging.

Capitalism can still save itself from its sins, which are many and varied, by meeting Communism on its own battle ground — not with blackjacks and tear gas, but by mending the wounds and ending the abuses which are spots for Communistic infection. It doesn't do much good to swat flies while the garbage pail is still breeding them.

Some capitalists are tempted to crack down on Communism. If they do, the result may be that capitalism will crack up.

Put prosperity back in the hands and pocketbooks of the American people, on a fair and sharing basis, and the Communist can talk his head off but he would not be able to hold a crowd to hear him.

—John D. Parry.

Clayville, N. Y.

Profiting By Past Mistakes

Dear Father Coughlin:

Spiritual writers tell us "Sanctity consists simply in doing the will of God." Therefore our sanctification and ultimate salvation depends on our doing those things in the interests of religion for which we are best fitted. We have no alternative. The path is lonely, but the eye of faith pierces the gloom and the heart experiences the joy of hope in its work of love.

In thinking of other Catholic economists and yourself I am reminded of that biblical cry, "Saul slew his thousands and David his tens of thousands." The result today is the same—the Sauls are jealous.

Social justice is only a dream without non-Catholic aid. You have rallied a great many of these to its support. Without your voice of leadership they are like sheep without a shepherd. With your voice silent, the enemies of social justice will become bolder in its violation and many of its disheartened friends lured by the siren call of Communism. All of which means that the "last state of the people will be worse than the first." There is no other choice for the priest and patriot that I know you are, but a return to active leadership. The only problem is the method of attack.

In the last election I participated in many meetings and I found that most of the congressional leaders and many of the minor officers, oftentimes innocently, alienated support for the National Union in one way or another. For this reason I think that it is a mistake to put up our own candidates. I believe that an announcement of such a policy would bring back all the old members and many new ones.

—Rev. L. A. Tobin.

Vernon, New York.

Small Money Group Controls Entire Communist Program

To the Editor:

The letters written by workers in the recent Fisher Body Company strike are so confusing that I cannot resist telling them a few facts I found out while traveling in Europe, and which I know to be the truth.

Being in sympathy with all workers, I must tell those on strike that they were being used as cat's paws to forge not only their own destruction but that of all the workers in this country.

Because workers as a rule are intelligent, I will give them a clue which may persuade them to think and investigate.

There exists in London a group of capitalists determined to gain world dominion. They wish to control all the money power in the world. Their plan is to destroy all capitalists and all other people who do not belong to their group. They incite revolutions and wars. These international capitalists **control and direct, the Moscow Bolsheviks, and through them, all Communists in the world.** Possessing enormous capital they buy up certain leaders and instruct them how to mislead the workers. After these capitalists have gained the upper hand, they treat the workingman as follows:

"We Bolshevists will find a way to make the Russian workmen fast, and if they object, we will finish them with machine gun bullets. Workmen whose lives are unrestrained become arrogant and undisciplined. Those who live in misery, forced to work through hunger, deprived of all civic rights, and who fear to be shot down upon offering the slightest resistance, are the kind we will bend to our will."

This was written by Radek (Sobleshn) to Walter Rathenau in 1919. It was also quoted by the Paris-Russian paper, "Vozrojdenie" on February 27, 1931. And it was emphasized by the Russian Communist General Netchvolodoff "Le Croisaide Contre-revolutionnaire" on April 15, 1931. See "World Service" December 15, 1936.

This has been accomplished in Russia.

These London capitalists can only gain their end when the nations are no longer able to defend themselves, so it is necessary to murder their leaders and loyal citizens. This is the reason they incite revolutions, and in all revolutions we find them murdering the leading classes whom they call "bourgeois." What are "bourgeois?" They are the middle class of workers, shopkeepers, school teachers, office workers and men who have saved enough to own a home. As these people are intelligent and sturdy, they would not submit to being exploited so they must be destroyed.

In Russia they have murdered 42-million people. Your common sense will tell you there were not that many rich people in the country. Who, then, were these victims? Communists who objected to being "made fast," as Radek calls it, and patriots who tried to defend their country. What became of the others? They are in slavery so brutal the world has never seen its equal. Why don't they leave the country? Because to try that is sure death.

Here is another of their rules: **"We must have our agents on both sides of every political movement so we can confuse and corrupt the workers. When they are ripe, we will use them to kill each other."**

Such American capitalists as do not belong to this London group have a harder fight for their existence than the workers can imagine, and unless all good Americans stand together to defend their country, God help them!

The trial just staged in Russia was a bluff to fool the world. Radek and the others are intelligent, ruthless leaders. They are probably needed in other countries — Spain, China, Mexico and the United States. They will be disguised, supplied with plenty of money and ordered to direct the world revolution.

When this group led us into the World war, their battle cry was "Make the world safe for democracy," as we walked into their trap. This time some similar bait will be used. To follow their leadership will mean democracy for them and death or slavery for us Americans.

—Serious.

Cleveland, Ohio.

"Know Social Justice" Contest Speeding To Close

--- YOU CAN STILL ENTER ---

368 Readers of Social Justice Will Win!

Questions For This Week

Picture No. 21

Picture No. 22

MAKE YOUR SELECTION BY NUMBER FROM THE FOLLOWING LISTS:

1. They are opposing religions.
2. They are opposing cults.
3. They are opposing creeds.
4. Communism violates the Golden Rule, which is Christian.
5. Communism does not believe in private ownership of property.
6. Communism does not believe in the divinity of Christ.
7. Christianity can thrive only under a democratic form of government.
8. Christians have never believed in the divine right of kings or rulers.
9. Communism believes in the supreme rights of the individual in a collective state, and Christianity does not.
10. Christianity believes the individual exists for the state, and Communism does not.

1. Russia.
2. Mexico.
3. Spain.
4. Radical labor leadership.
5. The Federal Reserve Banks.
6. Capitalistic greed.
7. Lack of religion.
8. An over issuance of government bonds.
9. Failure of trade with foreign nations.
10. American universities.

Fill in This Coupon and Mail with 10 Cents in Coin
NOT NECESSARY TO RETURN PICTURE
Make your selection by number from suggestions under each picture.
Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 21 For Question No. 21 I Select Answer No. [5] No. 22 For Question No. 22 I Select Answer No. [6]

MY NAME IS.....

MY ADDRESS IS.....

TOWN OR CITY.....STATE.....

AN EXTRA COUPON FOR A FRIEND OR RELATION

Fill in This Coupon and Mail with 10 Cents in Coin
NOT NECESSARY TO RETURN PICTURE
Make your selection by number from suggestions under each picture.
Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 21 For Question No. 21 I Select Answer No. [6] No. 22 For Question No. 22 I Select Answer No. [5]

MY NAME IS.....

MY ADDRESS IS.....

TOWN OR CITY.....STATE.....

Rules of Contest

1. Open to all readers of **SOCIAL JUSTICE**, except employes of Reverend Father Coughlin, members of the former National Board of the National Union for Social Justice, or members of their families.
2. Two pictures each week for 25 consecutive weeks, beginning Monday, December 21, 1936. Each picture contains a question concerning the principles of social justice laid down by Father Coughlin.
3. A Grand Prize of $2,500 will be awarded to the reader of **SOCIAL JUSTICE** returning the best or most appropriate answers to the questions appearing in all 50 pictures and otherwise complying with these rules. The reader or readers submitting the next nearest correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in order of their correctness.
4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner, the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each weekly coupon. The remittance of 10 cents in coin each week is in payment for Father Coughlin's book, "Money: Questions and Answers." Purchase of this book is a condition for entering the contest.
5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names or addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for coupons arriving unduly late. By entering the contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decision of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.
6. In event of ties additional pictures and questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.
7. Do **NOT** decorate coupons. Neatness will not count.
8. Any inquiry the reply to which could not affect outcome of contest will be acknowledged.
9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of answers, and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. A contestant sending in more than one fully paid set will be entitled to one book for each set submitted.

Only a few weeks left to strike for your share of 368 cash prizes—and three handsome automobiles—merely for knowing what Father Coughlin is claiming for America!

Only a few weeks in which to share in the great educational advantages of being a participant in our "KNOW SOCIAL JUSTICE" Contest.

The competition is more than one-third over—but does it yet mean anything to you?

Does it mean anything that some reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE will win a Grand Prize of $2,500.00 for sending in the best and most appropriate answers to 50 simple questions on social justice? That reader can be you!

How about your winning the Second Prize of $1,000.00 and a brand new Ford, Chevrolet or Plymouth sedan?

What about the Third Prize—$400.00 in cash and also a beautiful Ford, Chevrolet or Plymouth sedan?

Any of these prizes can be YOURS for only a few minutes THOUGHT each week for the next 14 weeks.

YOU ARE NOT YET TOO LATE—BUT YOU SOON WILL BE.

Today you can send in the "Past Pictures Coupon" below on this page, and within a few days all past pictures will be forwarded to you.

Then—a little serious thought on Father Coughlin's principles—and—who knows?—YOU CAN WIN AS WELL AS ANY MAN OR WOMAN, BOY OR GIRL IN THIS CONTEST.

So—send today for all past pictures. They cost you NOTHING, but could bring you much.

Make One of These Prizes Yours

Grand Prize $2,500.00

SECOND PRIZE $1,000.00— And the Choice of a Ford, Plymouth or Chevrolet Sedan

THIRD PRIZE $ 400.00— And the Choice of a Ford, Plymouth or Chevrolet Sedan

FOURTH PRIZE $ 100.00—Four Prizes of $50.00 Each

100 Prizes of $10.00 Each—260 Prizes of $5.00 Each

How to Proceed as a Contestant

1. All questions are based on the principles of social justice as laid down by Father Coughlin.
2. Study each question for a few moments. Don't rush. Read each of the suggested answers aloud. You will notice many of them are wrong answers. There is only one best or most appropriate answer to each question. That's the one you want.
3. When you have selected what you consider the proper answer fill in the coupon by writing the number of your selected answer in the little square opposite the large black number of the question.
4. Immediately you enter the contest you will receive Father Coughlin's book, "MONEY: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS." This book will aid in answering contest questions.
5. You may, if you wish, pay up in full your 10 cents per week by sending the whole $2.50. You then will send in your coupons weekly without further remittance.
6. If you run more than one set of answers, be sure to mark your sets "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3," etc. Each set stands alone in the judging. Coupons are NOT taken from one set to fill in bad "holes" in another set.

USE THIS PAST PICTURE COUPON NOW

"CONTEST EDITOR," SOCIAL JUSTICE
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

I wish to enter the "KNOW SOCIAL JUSTICE" Contest at once and be on an even footing with all other contestants.

Please send me free of charge, all Past Pictures which have appeared up to date.

My Name Is .....

My Address Is .....

Town or City .....State.....

Court Issue Fatal to Senate Democrats However Vote Goes

(Continued from Page 3)

Roosevelt would then be satisfied and would abandon his so-called "packing" bill. That was their hope, a hope so fervent almost as to be a prayer.

But apparently it is not to be gratified. The Supreme Court justices, say those who know them, could hardly be expected to quit under fire. They are appointed for life, subject to good behavior.

Supreme Court "Strike" Fantastic

As the hope of voluntary retirements in the court recedes, its place in Democratic minds is being taken by a dreadful thought. It is a thought both fantastic and fascinating. Suppose that the members of the Supreme Court, feeling the "rejuvenation" bill to be a reflection on their integrity, should resign —all nine of them!

Would that be a New Deal victory? Those who think the justices should be lined up and shot would, of course, say yes. But the saner Democrats feel that it would be a political catastrophe, one that would dramatize the "dictatorship" issue as nothing else could.

A mass walk-out in the Supreme Court is admittedly fantastic, and a commentator perhaps is foolish to entertain even the possibility of its taking place. But these are fantastic times.

Consider, for example, the case of Senator William Gibbs McAdoo, of California. He was one of the administration stalwarts who was called on to take to the air waves and convince the radio audience that Roosevelt was right; that justices 70 years old ought to retire and make way for younger men with modern ideas. McAdoo answered the call and spoke with gusto. Yet he himself is 74, and so far from being senile that he recently took unto himself a third bride, a trained nurse young enough to be his granddaughter!

Capital Undercurrents Hotter Than Comment

There is something fantastic, too, about the swiftness with which the Washington scene has changed. A little over a month ago, President Roosevelt, his head bared to the rain on the Capitol portico, cried out that what this country needed was a better "moral climate."

Today there are men in his own party who accuse him of befouling what moral climate there was. The debate that is taking place on the surface, angry as it is, gives no idea of the bitterness under the surface.

This is particularly true in the Senate, where the big fight over Roosevelt's bill will be staged. Although Chairman Ashurst, of the Senate judiciary committee, did a double somersault—saying a week before the president's proposal that he favored "bold" submission of a Constitutional amendment to the people, and then coming out for the president's proposal when the latter cracked the whip—the degree of political courage in the Senate is much higher than it is in the House.

White House Lunch Invitation Spurned

The other day, a "contact man" from the White House appeared at the Capitol and told an unruly Democratic Senator that the president would like to have him for dinner.

"You tell the President," said this Senator, "to save that dinner for one of his weak-kneed sycophants. Tell him, too, that I am going to fight him on this if it costs me my seat."

There is no doubt that if all 96 Senators voted according to their convictions, the president's Supreme Court bill would be defeated. The honest sentiment against it is overwhelming. But, of course, not all Senators are going to vote according to their convictions.

That is shown by the large number of Senators who still are on the fence, refusing to say which way they will vote. **Obviously, on an issue as clear-cut as this, a lawmaker could make up his mind in 10 minutes as to the right or wrong of the thing.**

Senators Waiting To Hear from Voters

What, then, are these "undecided" Senators—more than a third of the body—waiting for? For one thing, they are waiting to hear from more of their constituents. Those who have half-way made up their minds to vote against the court bill, providing sentiment at home continues to be against it, also are pondering the political consequences of defying the president. Here, they know, is the most powerful figure that has occupied the White House since the early days of the Republic, one who, through the denial of patronage or other favors, can cause them terrible humiliation at home, and, in the end, perhaps, bring about their political demise.

However, this much must be said for the score or more Senators opposed to the bill who have been summoned to the White House: Very few, **less than a half dozen, have been "converted" by the president.**

The one definite thing that has been developed by these White House conferences is that Roosevelt is determined to go through with his proposal, scorning any suggestion of a compromise.

President Firm Against Compromise

Poor Joe Robinson, the Democratic leader of the Senate, found this out when he suggested that the president's bill be amended, and that the retirement age for Supreme Court justices be moved up from 70 to 75. The next day a White House secretary called in reporters and told them that the president would stand for no such amendment. That silenced Joe.

Since the foes of the court bill are equally as determined as President Roosevelt, a slam-bang battle is in prospect. Should the administration forces line up a majority in favor of the bill, one of the greatest filibusters in the history of Congress may result.

Debate in the Senate is unlimited. A Senator may, if he chooses, talk until he falls exhausted, as many of them have done. Only one thing can check this privilege, and that is what is known as the cloture rule. Under this rule, the Senate agrees to limit each Senator to a certain amount of time for oratory, thus assuring a vote on the bill or resolution being debated. However, it takes a two-thirds vote to invoke cloture. And that means that if the foes of the court bill can muster one more than one-third, they can block a cloture rule, and then proceed to talk the court bill to death, each Senator taking a turn at holding the floor.

Backers of Bill Drop All Pretense

That the opponents of the bill in this case will number more than a third seems certain.

As the show-down stage gets near, the issue has been stripped of all camouflage. President Roosevelt's original arguments have been shattered. It is now known that the Supreme Court is not as he said, behind in its work, and that, from a physical standpoint, the nine old men do not need any help. Admittedly—and frank Henry Wallace, Secretary of the Agriculture, does the admitting—**the president's real purpose is to put men in the Supreme Court who will approve the legislation he thinks ought to be approved.**

In the eyes of those who are fighting the proposal, the president might as well try to abolish the court, for a court robbed of its independence they regard as worse than no court at all.

Opposition Rallies Strange Comrades

These foes of the court bill constitute one of the strangest fusions Capitol Hill has ever seen. In it are Republicans and Democrats, reactionaries and liberals. Some would leave the court as it is; others would shear it of much of its power. But all have one thing in common: They agree that whatever is done about the Supreme Court ought to be done in the American way, by submitting to the people an amendment to the Constitution.

Conservative old Carter Glass, of Virginia, is fighting shoulder to shoulder with young, impetuous Burton Wheeler, of Montana, a man whose liberalism makes that of Roosevelt seem pale and tame. Aligned with these two is young Bennett Champ Clark, of Missouri. His affection for Roosevelt is deep and sincere. But this time he thinks Roosevelt has tried to change the rules in the middle of the game, and that to him is bad sportsmanship. Then there are conservative Republicans like Hale, of Maine, and Steiwer, of Oregon, who for once find themselves in the same trench with the "Sons of the Wild Jackass"—Norris, of Nebraska, Borah, of Idaho, and Johnson, of California.

Johnson-Borah Feud Forgotten

In 1912 Hiram Johnson cost Charles Evans Hughes the presidency. Hughes needed only California to win, but he unwittingly snubbed Johnson on a visit to that state, and the result was that its electoral votes—and victory—went to Woodrow Wilson. Johnson, a supporter of Roosevelt heretofore, is fighting now to preserve the independence of the tribunal over which Hughes presides.

Hiram Johnson and William Edgar Borah—these are two magic names on Capitol Hill. The two men are superb orators, comrades-in-arms in many a notable battle. But they have not always been friends. Johnson turned against Borah savagely when the "Lion of the Rockies" refused to go with him into the Bull Moose camp in 1912. The feud lasted for 20 years. Johnson never missed a chance to harass and heckle Borah.

All that is forgotten now. These two veterans, facing what each regards as the supreme battle of his career, with the most powerful president in modern political history on the other side, may be seen together many times a day, talking over their strategy for the coming Armageddon.

EYES and EARS

(Continued from Page 3)

He was as popular among his people as was Napoleon among the French. He was urged to initiate a dynastic system whereby his popularity would perpetuate his tenure of office.

But Washington was cast in a different mold than Napoleon and all the dictators of history. He knew what limitless power does to men. He knew the oppression that individuals, once they aspire to be God-like, work upon their fellow men in order to extend their personal domination.

Washington took a course diametrically opposed to the course Napoleon elected to follow. He refused the open offer of dictatorship. He retired to private life when his popularity was at its highest —because he wanted to set the example of devotion to government through the insituations set up to maintain freedom.

Washington wanted to impress on posterity the lessson that institutions soundly built live on after men, powerful or weak, have passed away.

The wisdom of Washington is demonstrated by history. While the French nation retrogressed into the despotism which they had poured out their blood to abolish, the young republic of the Western Hemisphere grew strong and prosperous.

While the French people continued for a half-century to be the prey of the ambitions of men, the United States forged ahead, loyal to a Constitution that preserved their liberties.

Because the United States refused to deify any man or any president, it has become the most prosperous, the most liberal, the most solid government that man has ever known.

Those who followed Mr. Roosevelt yesterday and doubt him today, believe he is flying in the face of all human history when he seeks what in fact amounts to absolute power.

To millions, who applauded his power when the nation faced immediate crisis, he now appears more like Napoleon Bonaparte than like George Washington. And the American people have always revered Washington above all dictators.

Washington said that all changes in government should come from the people by the constitutional method of amending the Constitution.

No one doubts—unless, indeed, it be Mr. Roosevelt himself—that our popular president could have successfully led the drive for amending the Constitution to give Congress such power over our national industry as is needed to preserve the general welfare.

No one doubts that that objective could have been attained in record time.

That would have been the American way. It would have obtained direct and immediate results. It would have preserved the faith of a majority of our people in the democratic greatness of our national leader.

Such faith, so essential to a continuation of our recovery, has been undermined by our leader himself. It will retard the solution of our constitutional problem. All because one man thought himself greater than the Constitution.

WEEK in the WORLD

New Berlin

BERLIN, GERMANY.—Adolf Hitler has decreed the erection of a new Berlin which "will be a permanent monument to the Revolution of 1933."

Plans have been viewed from a long range. A man has been chosen who is only 31, so that he may devote the next 20 or 30 years to the project. He is Albert Speer, who has been given the title of General Director of Buildings. He first came to the notice of Der Fuehrer in constructing the gigantic temple at Nurnberg for the 1936 convention of the Nazi party. The temple housed 150,000 brown-shirted Nazis, plus a host of dignitaries.

Mr. Speer is directly responsible to Hitler. Not even a cabinet officer has jurisdiction over his activities.

Leprosy

MANILA, PHILIPPINES. — A startling announcement was recently made by Dr. Earl B. McKinley, of George Washington University, who said "We believe we have isolated the true germ of leprosy."

The doctor, dean of medicine at the university and formerly associated with the Rockefeller Foundation in the Philippines, arrived in Manila after four months intensive research work in the Culion island leper colony which houses nearly 6,000 lepers.

"We have carried live cultures of this germ for as long as five years," he said. "What we need now is to develop several thousand of these cultures. Quantity production is impossible except at a large colony such as Culion and without highly specialized equipment, which I brought with me.

"At Culion, we grow these germs and then experiment by skin tests with children who have been exposed to the disease over a period of time, but who have not yet manifested any symptoms of the disease. It is our hope to develop a method for the skin tests which will insure perfect immunity. Through this we hope to be able to stop leprosy before it starts."

Paris Fair "Red"

PARIS, FRANCE. — The Paris 1937 world exposition may not open as scheduled on May 1, despite a passionate speech Premier Leon Blum made recently to the workmen in the half finished pavilions.

"Our May 1st must be triumphant," he pleaded.

Red flags fluttered overhead alongside of the French flag.

The Echo de Paris said:

"Blum does not hesitate to make this French enterprise a 'Popular Front' matter. Getting the fair ready in time is to be a battle against the government coalition's opposition. We have the right to be astonished by such language, which is unworthy of the head of the government. It is excellent publicity for the 1937 exposition."

The Social Justice Laurel Wreath

Is Awarded to President of Radio Station WLW Powel Crosley, Jr.

BECAUSE he recently took part in performing a great public service during the greatest flood crisis in the nation's history.

BECAUSE the Crosley facilities, including 500,000-watt WLW—the largest radio station in the country—station WSAI, and portable short wave equipment were used extensively by organized relief agencies and officials throughout the emergency.

BECAUSE when the city of Cincinnati was preparing to prevent that dreaded aftermath of every flood—a typhoid epidemic—Mr. Crosley provided free vaccination for every employe.

BECAUSE he was in personal touch with every move during the crisis; he placed the facilities of WLW at the disposal of the Red Cross for use in the anticipated Mississippi flood.

BECAUSE WLW broadcast 24 hours daily, urging listeners to rally to the financial assistance of the flood sufferers, and raised thousands of dollars for the cause.

BECAUSE, as head of the Cincinnati Reds baseball club, he was instrumental in organizing the Knot Hole Club, which provides summer recreation for 40,000 boys from 9 to 16 years old.

AND, FINALLY, BECAUSE radio station WLW, by its service in dealing with the flood disaster in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, has amply justified its title as "The Nation's Station."

Crosley Got Radio Bug in Building Set for Son

Powel Crosley, Jr., came to radio by a very circuitous route. It took the desire of his son for a receiving set to finally put him on his way.

The president of Station WLW was born September 18, 1886, in Cincinnati. He attended public schools in the Queen City, and after one year in high school enrolled in the Ohio Military Institute. On his graduation he became a student of mechanical engineering for one year at the University of Cincinnati.

The next two years he studied law and then joined a bond house in Cincinnati. In 1910 he organized a company to manufacture a low-priced six-cylinder automobile, but failed due to lack of financial backing.

Builds Own Set

For some time in his early career, Mr. Crosley, the son of a lawyer, was affiliated with various automobile manufacturing concerns as salesman and advertising man. In 1916 he started a mail order business, and later a company for the manufacture of phonographs.

About this time his son, Powel, the third, then 9 years old, developed and evinced a predilection for one of those new-fangled radio sets. Prices in those days were prohibitive. One-tube sets were priced at $130, a rather expensive toy for a lad of 9.

Instead of buying the set, the father purchased the materials and an instruction book. His effort was crowned with such success that out of it grew the germ of an idea. Radio—something new!

Founds Station WLW

From this modest, dilletantish beginning grew what was to become the Crosley Radio Corporation.

In 1921 Powel Crosley undertook his first experiment in the broadcasting business. One year later he was issued his first license under the call letters of WLW. It was a 20-watt-er. Soon the power was increased to 50 watts, then to 500, later to 5,000, to 50,000, and finally to 500,000.

The 500,000 watt transmitter, making WLW the most powerful broadcasting station in the country, was dedicated in May, 1934.

WLW Staff and Facilities Active in Flooded Areas

When the Ohio river rose three feet the night of January 20, sending hundreds of families from their homes and creating Cincinnati's first major emergency in years, the facilities of station WLW were placed at the disposal of national, state and local authorities.

Tuesday morning, January 21, WLW broadcast an appeal for boats for use by the Red Cross, American Legion, Y. M. C. A. and kindred organizations which were at work evacuating families. That was the beginning of a 24-hour daily service that lasted more than two weeks.

Thursday noon a Crosley mobile unit was operating in Newport, Ky., broadcasting interviews with relief officials and refugees. At the Cincinnati city hall, Safety Director John H. Ames was listening in. He called a WLW official with information that Mount Washington, a residential suburb, was completely isolated with telephone, gas, light and water.

Driving 100 miles over detours to reach the district, 12 miles from downtown Cincinnati, R. L. Tedford and Oscar Presnell, Crosley engineers in charge of the mobile unit, set up their equipment and communications by short-wave began. For 10 days or more the Crosley short-wave units not only provided 24-hour communication with Mount Washington but made it possible for the fire department to have 1,000 watts of lighting power.

The facilities of WLW meantime were being used by United States engineers, the American Red Cross, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Boy Scouts and many other emergency relief groups. Official messages and instructions were broadcast at intervals to workers, while listeners throughout the nation were kept posted on the rising river.

Sunday morning, January 24, gasoline on flood waters around the main Crosley plant caught fire. Within a few minutes an area of several city blocks was a raging inferno. Firemen battled the blaze for 36 hours. More than a score of buildings were destroyed. All the buildings of the Crosley group were destroyed with the exception of the main factory and—as though by an act of Providence—the broadcasting studios.

As the river continued to rise, Cincinnati's electric supply was threatened. The city's pumping stations were flooded, necessitating the rationing of water supplies. Through WLW emergency broadcasts, thousands of gallons of water were trucked to Cincinnati from nearby cities.

WLW was on the air 24 hours a day, and Mr. Crosley was in personal touch with every activity. Mobile units were sent to the deluged cities of Louisville and Paducah, Ky., where local broadcasting facilities were crippled.

An American Airlines transport plane was placed at the disposal of the Crosley stations, permitting a crew of WLW announcers, engineers and news men to fly to Louisville and Memphis with portable transmitting equipment. This volunteer crew kept relief agencies informed of flood conditions down the Ohio to Cairo, Ill., and on down the Mississippi to Memphis.

The foregoing facts provide, of course, only a cameo picture of the part WLW, with other stations, played in the flood disaster. This is enough, however, to stamp Mr. Crosley, the man who made the service possible, as a true practician of social justice and worthy of its "laurel wreath."

SOCIAL JUSTICE accords the "Laurel Wreath" recognition to Powel Crosley, Jr., because of his noteworthy contribution in a crisis that touched the heart of the nation. We are not unmindful, however, of the many others who, on and off the scene, by direct action or financial donations, assisted in the rescue and care of the flood refugees.

The nation will not soon forget the outstanding work of radio stations WHAS (Louisville) and WSM (Nashville). Nor will it forget the efficient, impersonal voices of announcers at the microphone, and the aching arms of others pulling at oars and snatching men, women and children from the jaws of death.

11 R. O. PRINTING COMPANY Royal Oak, Michigan